THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXLIII, No. 1 JULY, 1960

CONTENTS

Reflections on Darwinism ..... *G. Bosio, S.J.* 1

Commentary on "Reflections on Darwinism" *William M. Agnew, S.J.* 18

Avignon: A City of Ghosts ..... *Monialis* 21

John Moschus: Monk Marian Witness ..... *Vincent Vasey, S.M.* 26

The Seminary and Public Relations ..... *William Joyce, C.S.Sp.* 35

Devotion to the Sacred Heart: II ..... *Peter C. Milward, S.J.* 40

Opening "The Closed Book" of the New Testament *William H. Quiery, S.J.* 49

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Substitutes for a High Mass 57

The Voter's Obligation 57

Marking the Paschal Candle 61

Chant Problems 61

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review. The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1960 by The Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

Flectamus Genua 62

Priests' Communion Outside Mass 63

BOOK REVIEWS

The Liturgy of the Mass, *by Pius Parsch* 64

General Ethics, *by Kenneth F. Dougherty* 65

Anscar Vonier, Abbot of Buckfast, *by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B.* 66

The Hours of the Day: Latin-English Diurnal, *by the Assumptionist Fathers* 67

Awakeners of Souls, *by F. X. Ronsin, S.J.* 68

Father of the Family, *by Eugene S. Geissler* 69

BOOKS RECEIVED 71

HOW SHOULD PRIESTS DIRECT PEOPLE REGARDING THE MOVIES?
with APPENDIX—1957

Legion of Decency

By
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

(Reprinted by Popular Demand)

This article originally appeared in the April 1946 edition of The American Ecclesiastical Review. An Appendix has been added, and the 16-page reprint is now available in an attractively bound, paper cover.

Single copy ..... 30¢
In lots of 10 ..... 25¢ ea.
In lots of 25 ..... 22¢ ea.
In lots of 50 ..... 20¢ ea.

Prices Postpaid

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America **Washington 17, D.C.**

In answering advertisements please mention THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

REFLECTIONS ON DARWINISM

One hundred years have passed[1] since the publication of the *Origin of Species* by Charles Darwin (November 24, 1859), a work that enjoyed immense success from the start.[2] In England, many editions followed the first; all, including the definitive one of 1872, were supervised personally by Darwin himself. Translations of the work were made into various languages; popular and scientific writings about the problem of the origin of species, and Darwin's interpretation of it, increased and multiplied. The English naturalist became famous throughout the world. Hence the Centenary of such an event could hardly go unnoticed.

Not to speak of other countries, Italy has a new edition of Darwin's work, with an historical Introduction by Professor Montalenti.[3] We begin our appraisal of the Darwin Centenary by citing a passage from this Introduction:

> The year 1859 must be reckoned as one of the most important in history, if history should be taken to mean the grand conquests achieved by the mind of man, and not just a record of merely political and military events—more or less noteworthy. In the course of time the importance of Darwin's book has become clear under two principal aspects. In the first place it heralded the coming of the theory of evolution. True, the theory of evolution had a few other precursors, and some of them distinguished. However, the definitive advance into modern thought of the theory of evolution followed only upon the publication of the work of Darwin. And this has a direct interest for the whole human race. For it completely reversed the place that man hitherto occupied in nature. It has dethroned the "king of creation."

[1] The following is a translation of an article by G. Bosio, S.J., which appeared in *La Civiltà Cattolica* for November 28, 1959: "RIFLESSIONI SUL DARWINISMO, a cent'anni dalla pubblicazione del' *Origine delle specie*." The translation, made by William M. Agnew, S.J., Rome, has the approval of the author. The translator has also added a Commentary, printed after the article.

[2] The full title of the original work is: *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. It is referred to generally, as we do in this article, as *Origin of Species*.

[3] Charles Darwin, *L'origine delle specie*. Translated into Italian by L. Fratini. Introduction by G. Montalenti. (Torino: Einaudi, 1959), pp. LXXI + 551.

It has forced him to march back in line with the other phenomena of nature. Man has become just another one of those organized forms which appear on the face of the earth in a succession of history. And this process is exactly what we call "evolution."

Secondly, there is the profound biological implication of Darwin's work. And in this too, the grandeur of the man as well as his work shines out. For the interpretation which Darwin gives to the causes of biological evolution are strictly "natural." That is to say, they are susceptible of scientific analysis. To this scientific analysis, Darwin dedicated himself with scrupulous care. He applied himself to it with the steady purpose of never indulging in any metaphysical interpretations. . . . Such, summoning into action superior "forces," or "impulses," or "tendencies" or "designs," introduce criteria into science's domain, which are and should remain outside, as far as science is concerned (pp. XI-XII).[4]

Professor Montalenti's manner is high and solemn, but his words are significant. They reflect the attitude of many. We for our part grant Darwin's success, and we are far from gainsaying it. In these reflections on Darwinism let us make it clear, though, that we are setting out to find the answers to two questions: *why* was Darwin's work a success? And *what* is the scientific *value* of the Darwinian theory?

The acclaim given to the *Origin of Species* was due in part to worthy scientific motives. No one before Darwin had gathered together such a great mass of facts and observations. No one had had the genius to evaluate and arrange this data toward demonstrating that species have evolved. No one, of Darwin's calibre, had so bravely posed such a formidable array of objections and tried hard to answer them. And when he could not answer, he simply admitted that he could not. Besides all this, evolution does involve some rather hazy zones; some cross-currents that can set the mind in a whirl. But Darwin succeeded in presenting it in such wise that evolution came to be a scientifically tenable theory. He utilized all the biological research of the mid-nineteenth century, building an ediface, as it were, and laying out grounds with ample space for further development. In the end, he provided for all this a viewpoint at once simple and all-embracing; a viewpoint

[4] The page numbers in parenthesis throughout the article refer to the pages of this Italian translation mentioned in note 3.

that seemed to reduce all those big problems of biology to one. How could this help but attract the mind, any human mind, seeking a unified and consistent explanation of biological species? Darwin understood this, for he once wrote:

> It has been said that the success of the *Origin* demonstrated that "the question was in the air" and that "the minds of men were ready." I do not believe that this is exactly the case. It was true, I think, that through observation, numerous *facts* had been accumulated in the minds of naturalists, and that these facts were ready to be systematized and put into their rightful place as soon as there would be elaborated, with sufficient clarity, a *theory* to receive them (p. XXX).

But right here is where we have to call a halt. In this statement from the *Autobiography,* Darwin apprises us of another reason, besides the scientific one; a psychological reason for the success of his work. The two reasons, scientific and psychological, have to be separated.

LAMARCK AND EVOLUTION

The idea that species were transformed with the passage of time was not new with Darwin. There was a "theory capable of receiving the facts," and it existed, not to go too far back, 50 years before the *Origin of Species* was published. Darwin himself tells us as much:

> Lamarck with his conclusions was the first to arouse a lively interest in the argument. This naturalist, of celebrated memory, published the results of his researches for the first time in 1801. In 1809, in *Philosophical Zoölogy,* he notably developed his idea. And again in 1815, in the Introduction to *A Natural History of Invertebrate Animals.* In this last work he held the theory that all species, including man, have descended from a previous species. Lamarck it was who first rendered to science the important service of calling attention to the possibility that any change whatsoever in the organic world or the inorganic world, could be the result of a law and not of a miraculous intervention (p. 4).

We pass over that notion about "miraculous intervention," an error into which, along with Darwin, Montalenti often falls. We need here only make the necessary precisions, and it is clear from Darwin's own statement that a theory capable of receiving the facts, without going outside the ambit of natural causes, already existed. But that was the budding age of Positivism, Materialism, Hegelian-

ism, and the ideas of Lamarck aroused but a modest echo in comparison with those of Darwin. With good reason, for they are as different as night and day.

The French scientist interpreted the *fact* of evolution in a clearly *finalistic* way. According to Lamarck, the changes which the ever-changing conditions of the external world induce in organisms tend to produce in the organisms themselves an ever more perfect adaptation to their surroundings. This active adaptation in turn depends on an "inner disposition," which the organisms show when confronted with new needs.

But Darwin's interpretation is *anti-finalistic*. For Darwin, "chance variations" of environment are accompanied by "chance modifications" of the organisms. If these modifications are harmful, the individuals die in the struggle for life; if advantageous, the survival of the subjects who possess them is facilitated. The organisms transmit them to their descendants. From generation to generation there comes to be an accumulation of ever new modifications, until at a given moment, the species can no longer be recognized. And at this point you have the formation of a *new* species. The observer has the impression that the organisms adapt themselves to the changing conditions, with a truly marvellous finality. But that impression is false, since the selection of the more apt happens by chance; it happens blindly; it happens fortuitously. There is no finalism involved. There is no intrinsic principle which induces the organisms to adapt themselves to the new and changing conditions.

Here is the secret at last. We have pushed back to the area of *Metaphysics,* as St. Thomas understands the term. And in the order of final cause (or rather its denial), we find the bedrock reason for the success of Darwin's theory as opposed to Lamarck's. Montalenti quite explicitly recognizes this:

> The evolutionary doctrine found fertile ground in the materialism and positivism of the second half of the nineteenth century; and for its own part brought forward arguments of great weight in favor of those conceptions (p. XLVII). The interpretation of Darwin is strictly and rigorously scientific, while on the other hand the orthogenetic theories (of Lamarck and others) are the contrary. Really, they are but camouflage for the ignorance of their authors (p. LI). The Darwinian theory "removed the necessity of a vitalistic and *finalistic* interpretation. It

was a triumph of science; of reason, in an era when science was progressing with ever increasing momentum; when the currents of *mechanism* and *materialism* swept all before them" (p. XLII).

Men who represented *those* currents in England, Germany, France and Italy became patrons of the Darwinian theory, spreading it with great zeal. Generally speaking, the adherents of materialism patronized it (not only the naturalists), for they found in it "arguments of great weight" in their favor. The enemies of the Church fashioned from Darwinian theory, after the publication of the *Origin of Man,* in 1871, a weapon on behalf of their own dogma and morals. (In the *Origin of Man,* as is known, Darwin has everyone derive from simian ancestry.) We call on Montalenti again to confirm this:

> The origin and evolution of humanity, as illustrated in evolutionary doctrine, and the concept of the struggle for existence, have given equilibrium to the postulates of socialism and dialectical materialism; and to their concepts of history. We see that Marx and Engels acclaimed Darwinism enthusiastically, with, it is true, a certain reserve on some specific points. [He records one such reservation]: Especially as regards the "false law of Malthus." This they oppose because it identifies the cause of misery with the natural disproportion between the numerical increase of the population and the means of subsistence, rather than in the exploitation of one social class by another (p. XXXIX).

The reasons why Darwin's book was so cordially received were scientific, it is true, and that is meant in a laudable sense; but they were mainly *psychological.* The whole temper of the times and especially the counterpoise of Lamarck's theory bring this profound psychological reason into sharp relief. However, as regards this second reason, there is a question as to whether Darwin foresaw the use to which his book would be put, and we will try to answer that question.

What really goes on in the mind of a man? Where an effort to find out is indicated, as in Darwin's case, we mortals can only go by external evidences, and try to formulate a fair but charitable estimate. Darwin had no liking for philosophy and very few philosophical ideas. There are some errors along this line in his work where he ascribes ideas to others (as, for example, where he cites a passage from Aristotle in which he sees "hidden the principle of natural selection" not realizing that Aristotle puts the

words in the mouth of an adversary) (p. 3).[5] Perhaps Darwin *was* diffident about the capacity of the human intelligence to arrive at a solution of the big problems arising out of philosophy; little wonder! How could a logic which derived from simian ancestry arrive at the solution of these problems? At any rate Darwin did not like speculation. He ran from whatever seemed like an abstraction, or a deduction from concepts. He avoided metaphysics and set his face toward the "facts." As soon as he thought he had found a plausible cause of these—and the more proximate the better—he stopped short. On the other hand he neither countenanced nor shared those generalizations in which the materialists indulged. He himself did *not* arrive at the extreme conclusions which the materialists believed could be reached. Marx wanted to dedicate the second volume of *Das Kapital* to him. Darwin replied thanking him for "the honor," but turning down the offer in a somewhat evasive manner, "because it might in a certain sense suggest acceptance of the work as a whole, which I do not well know" (p. XXXIX).

DARWIN AND RELIGION

We have even more explicit and significant indications of his inner thoughts concerning religious matters. By 1859, Darwin had lost the faith of his youth, but had not for all that become an atheist (or to put it bluntly, an enemy of God). Precisely *what* his concept of the Divinity was by this time it is hard to say. He wrote the following to one of his correspondents in 1870:

> As far as my opinions go, it is really something of interest to no one but myself. But since you ask me, I can tell you that my judgment often fluctuates. . . . In these extreme fluctuations I have never been an atheist in the sense of denying the existence of God. It seems to me, generally speaking (and the older I get the more so) though not always, that the better definition of my thoughts would be "Agnostic" (p. XXXVIII).

Yet twenty years earlier, in the first edition of the *Origin of Species,* and again in the definitive edition of 1872, he concluded the text with these words:

> So from the war of nature, from famine and death, there directly derives the most elevated object which can be conceived, that is, the

---

[5] *Phy.* B, 8, 198 b, 24-32.

production of the human animal. There is something grand in this concept of life with its diversity of powers originally impressed by the Creator in a few forms or in only one form. And while our planet has continued to rotate, according to the immutable law of gravity, there have evolved and continue to evolve, from one so simple a beginning, innumerable forms, beautiful and marvellous (p. 524).

Among the materialistic admirers of Darwin, Julian Huxley for one chooses to ignore those words about "these diverse powers originally impressed by the Creator." He winds up an article he wrote for *Life Magazine* with a kind of peroration, citing the last paragraph of the *Origin of Species*.[6] Then he does a peculiar thing. When he comes to these words, he drops them out leaving before the eyes of the astonished reader just three little dots (viz: . . .). At any rate those who would justify Darwin on the score of religion do cite *another* passage:

I do not see any reason why the opinions exposed in this work should disturb the religious faith of anyone whomsoever (p. 515).

This passage argues in Darwin's favor if you consider *only* the *Origin of Species*. But truth demands that the man's works as a whole be entered in the reckoning, and the statement is belied by Darwin's doctrine in the *Origin of Man*, where he sets himself in open opposition to dogma.

The materialistic "superstructures," legitimate or not, foreseen or not, were certainly never openly repudiated by Darwin. There can be no doubt that they were used in the diffusion of his theory; and they did do great harm to evolution as an historical fact. For "evolutionism" and "Darwinism" have come to be practically synonymous. It has become difficult to separate the *fact* of evolution from the *theory* which aimed at explaining the causes and mechanisms. It so happens that if for one reason or another, the *explanations* turn out not to be acceptable, there is a tendency to reject the *fact*. After all, whether or not evolution is a fact will depend exclusively on the proofs which can be brought forward to sustain it.

This is the Darwinian Centenary. The man and his doctrine are, for weal or woe, bound together. Hence, before rounding out our

[6] Julian Huxley, "Darwin Discovers Nature's Plan," in *Life* (June 30, 1958), p. 86.

appraisal of the man it will be necessary to appraise his doctrine. We will examine Darwinian theory from the time of Darwin to the present. Our appraisal will be the answer to this key question: Is the general *theory of Darwin* scientifically tenable?

BASIC PRINCIPLES

It is founded, as we have indicated and now emphasize, on three principles: (1) the existence of minute hereditary *variations* among individuals even the most similar, (2) the existence of the *struggle* for life according to the law of Malthus, (3) the consequent natural *selection* of the fit:

> Given that in every species there are born such a large number of individuals that some are not able to survive; and given, therefore, that the struggle for existence is an ever present fact, it follows that every being which undergoes a variation, however slight, to its own advantage, in the conditions of life in its entirety, and in frequent changes, will have a greater likelihood of survival, and will be in this way *naturally selected*. On the basis of this powerful principle of heredity, every selected variation will tend to multiply its new and modified form (p. 18). The accumulations of innumerable slight variations, each one useful to its possessor (p. 495), will determine such a divergence of characteristics as to constitute a new species. Finally, "Since natural selection works exclusively by means of the good and for the good of each being, all qualities of body and of mind will tend to make progress toward perfection" (p. 523).

Here is the mechanism excogitated by Darwin: the mechanism so important and general in the formation of new species. There have been (and not just in recent times either) many and serious objections against it.

First of all as regards the *natural selection*. What is it?

There can be no doubt that the husbandman has, from time immemorial, bred strains of corn or cattle for his own purposes and uses. This is *selection* as operated under the guidance of human intelligence, skill and ingenuity (whether as in days gone by, or in modern times, with more scientific "know-how"). Darwin takes this concept of *selection* as operated *by man* and applies it, without the necessary refinements, to nature *left to itself*. But, what happens in nature left to itself?

The number of individuals which at a given moment show slight variation, without possessing at the same time any disadvantageous

variations, is small. On the other hand, the number of subjects which remain unchanged (or undergo only indifferent modifications) is comparatively very large. The question is how can that *minimal* number get the "upper hand," as it were, over the mass of the population—left as they are, all to themselves, and receiving nought from the helping hand of man? The difficulty is further emphasized by another observation.

According to the laws of genetics, this *minimal* number in question is even further reduced by a crossing (in any event extremely probable) with the large number of normal individuals; and in the process the variation can pass into a latent state, *never* manifesting itself in the offspring.

Moreover, the "slight" variations prove eventually useful only when they have reached *full development,* whereas experience shows that the greatest mortality among organisms occurs in their *early* stages. Given the importance which Darwin assigns to these slight modifications, and following out his thought consistently, the young individuals ought *all* to perish.

Selection, in nature left to itself, has to contend against the greatest odds; practically speaking, they are invincible. *Selection* operated by man is an entirely different matter. In the latter case, the odds against selection disappear because of the *human* agent, who selects and cross-breeds only the fit individuals, isolating and conserving one form rather than another. The two concepts are *not* the same, and we can only conclude that *natural selection* does not have the power attributed to it by Darwin. This holds true, even aside from the fact that the struggle for life (of which it is one consequence) is verified much more between species and species, than between the *members* of the same species.

But there is a difficulty (much more fundamental) against this evolving mechanism—a difficulty which has not been resolved, but rather augmented by scientific research since Darwin's time. Darwin speaks of modifications and variations which appear habitually in organisms. Without too often stopping to investigate their causes and without defining them and telling us just what they are, he goes right on. He blandly assumes, as perfectly compatible with his doctrine, that "powerful principle of heredity," which of a truth *must* hand on to the offspring these modifications and accumulations; nor could he do otherwise. But the powerful prin-

ciple of heredity works in a way quite *different* from that supposed in the "evolving mechanism." So much so, that the crucial challenge to the Darwinian theory is right here. What evidence has genetics to show that one species does change into another?

VARIATIONS

Geneticists distinguish three types of variations: fluctuations, somatic changes and mutations. *Fluctuations* seem to correspond exactly to the kind of variation in which Darwin has the greatest confidence.

(1) So let us start with fluctuations. What are they? An example will illustrate better than a plethora of words. From a normal population of paramecia, isolate one individual. These protozoa generally multiply by direct division of the cellular body and nucleus, and hence we will soon have from the subject which we have isolated, a *new* colony of paramecia. They have the same hereditary patrimony, they are living in the same conditions. Let us then single out one easily observable characteristic of the fully matured paramecia: i.e., their size. This is what we find. The majority are large; but there are some giants and some dwarfs.

Again isolate—this time one individual from each of the two *extremes*. Allow them to multiply so as to obtain two new populations. What happens? *Contrary* to what we might expect, both the dwarf and the giant become progenitors of paramecia whose size varies from small to very large, the colony having a *mean size*, identical to that which was observed in the first experiment. Therefore the progeny do *not* inherit the variations of the parent stock (small size or giant size), but they inherit, rather, a *variability*, which is confined within well-defined and impassible limits. These modifications geneticists call "fluctuations."

We draw this conclusion: *in so far* as the Darwinian theory rests on the inheritance of "fluctuations," and purports to explain by means of them the mechanism of evolution, it is manifestly *erroneous*.

(2) Darwin attributes some value to the second type of variations: *somatic* changes (they were dear to the heart of Lamarck). Hence, let us now take up these and see what they have to show.

We will use the paramecia again (changing one circumstance of the experiment). In demonstrating fluctuations we considered

the *variabilities* of individuals having the same hereditary patrimony, and developing in identical conditions. We now isolate from the colony (in order to have the same hereditary patrimony) two individuals as much *alike* as possible. One we place in unfavorable conditions: bad light, irregular heat, scant nourishment; the other in the best as to light, heat, nourishment. The two colonies resulting are greatly different. The members of the first (bad conditions) are in the main smaller, more "miserable" than the members of the second. Repeat the experiment as often as you like but the results will not change. You may now be under an illusion, i.e., that characteristics acquired by the influence of *environment* are transmitted to the offspring and are therefore hereditary. But wait! Again it is the environment which induces in each new generation the variations which were induced in the first. For after any number of generations: take the poorest, if you will, the most wretched of the paramecia, born and raised in the unfavorable environment; put it to develop where there is light, warmth and food, and the *same* gives rise to a colony of *strong* and *prosperous* individuals!

Geneticists go on to explain that these modifications of the organism are arrested in their "soma" (and for this reason are called *somatic*). Not being able to get at those mysterious elements on which depends the transmission of life, they *disappear* at the death of the subject.

We are driven to another conclusion: *to the extent* that Darwin's theory rests on the inheritance of "somatic qualities," it is scientifically *erroneous.*

For Darwin, the raw material out of which natural selection is almost exclusively fashioned is one or other of these *two* types of variations: fluctuations or somatic changes. Our judgment at this point must remain unfavorable, seeing that neither of these variations has anything to show for evolution. We might begin to wonder, why the Centenary celebrations? We have not finished, however, for, as Montalenti insists:

> There can be no doubt that the direction which modern Genetic evolution has taken starts from the work of Darwin, then develops it, completes it, and modifies it where necessary (p. LXV).

We are apprised then of *corrections* affixed by modern Genetic evolution. And as we are "trying the spirits," here is the chal-

lenge: what is there to show? Natural selection? At this point let us say: "extremely weak." Fluctuations? "No." Somatic changes? "No." But Darwin, it is said, set the ball rolling and modern genetics has picked it up. So we ask with renewed expectation: does the general theory of Darwin prove out, at length, to be satisfactory in some other way?

(3) We come now to examine the *third* kind of variations: "mutations." These mysterious elements (chromosomes, genes), which transmit hereditary characteristics, can indeed undergo alterations, which determine the appearance of any new particular characteristic in the offspring.

Darwin took little notice of mutations. Modern geneticists, however, take a lot of notice of them. And why? Precisely because mutations are, without doubt, hereditary. . . . Here at last, we may say, is a mechanism by which to transmit accumulations, modifications, etc. But let us see.

There is one type of mutations which is either pathological or completely lethal; such evidently cannot explain evolution, so we need not bother with it. The mutations we *are* concerned with bring about in the organisms which undergo them slight—no, it would be more exact to say, the very slightest—alterations. Montalenti points out two characteristics of these mutations. They are, he says: "casual; non-orientated, that is, they arise in various directions which are *unpredictable,* and with a *low frequency,* usually" (p. LXI). Well ~~and~~ good. We are going to add, however, two more characteristics of these "very slightest alterations." And they are as equally certain: (1) Mutations, in general, are *regressive:* that is to say, they are *disadvantageous* to the organisms affected by them. (2) And they are also *recessive:* that is to say, they appear in the offspring only when transmitted by *both* parents.

So we have at this point: "slightest alterations" which are casual, non-orientated; and which are generally both "regressive" and "recessive."

Are these mutations observed in nature? Are they spontaneous? Or are they produced in the laboratory under carefully supervised physical and chemical conditions? Essentially, of course, they come to the same thing. Thus, let us consider mutations as mutations.

Pathological or death-dealing mutations are of no use. Disadvantageous mutations are of no use. (And they are by far the more frequent.) How logical is it, then, to assert (as Morgan and others do) that these "visible," "unfavorable" alterations can indicate *invisible, favorable* changes?[7] Indifferent mutations, at least in so far as they are *indifferent,* are of no use. For "selection" and "indifference" involve *contradictions.*

There remain an extremely small number of cases in which there is observed the sudden appearance of some *advantageous* mutation, which is lost in the multitude of individuals who remain normal or are affected by damaging changes. In order to transmit this to the offspring, there has to be a cross with another individual, bearing *exactly* the *same mutation.* If this should not occur, then, the mutation is transmitted, but it remains more or less forever in the latent state. It will not become manifest in an anatomical or functional variation. It will not be able to bring about "selection."

If we weigh these telling factors; if we keep in mind that mutations are a phenomenon of the *rarest* occurrence in nature, is it logical to conclude that mutations may be the mechanism for the *gradual rise* of new species? The difficulty is compounded by Paleontology. For Paleontology already confronts us with a mass of evidence *against* a "gradual rise" of species. As Paleontology shows, *species* (i.e., large numbers of the same kind of individuals) appear suddenly! unexpectedly!—so much so, that paleontologists speak of the "explosion" of new forms.[8]

Now for the final challenge to mutations: Supposing that advantageous variations *are* quite frequent (although they certainly are

[7] The author observed above that evolution involves some cross-currents that can set the mind in a whirl. Here is one example. It is as if to say: You avoid starch because it makes you fat, or you eat lettuce because it makes you thin. But do you realize that these visible effects of starchy or lean food can have *invisible* effects which are just the contrary? Starch can make you thin, but invisibly, of course. Lettuce can make you fat, granted that the obesity will not show. Starch can bring you—thin (though invisibly so)—to an early but *scientific* grave. You may slim down to a silly old ninety on lettuce if you wish. You can still be invisibly fat. And just remember this: if the day should ever dawn when you can count 100 years of experience behind you, you will not be scientific, if you hold (as some medievalists did) that the qualities and perceptible operations of a thing manifest its nature.

[8] Noteworthy in this connection is the judgment of Pope Pius XII as to

not). Supposing that they *can* succeed in appearing in the offspring with relative ease (although this is not the case). What *do* they produce?

They produce at most minor characteristics. That is to say, they can give rise to a new *variety* within a species; they *never* give rise to a *new species!*

CONCLUSIONS

Neither Adam who named the animals and recognized himself as distinct from them, nor Aristotle who wrote a great deal about biological species, nor we ourselves today, deny that there are many different and interesting things in this world. Modern biology has produced long catalogs of species. Darwinian theory has had a hundred years of trial and error. And the barriers between the species remain fixed! Neither fluctuations, nor somatic changes, nor mutations have demonstrated *one single change* of one single species into another.

There is, however, a way of announcing sad news. Montalenti in that long introduction admits failure, and the manner in which he does it is intriguing:

> Actually, in the renaissance of evolution, you are not required to believe that everything is certain; that every last problem is resolved. No. *Many problems* remain open for free discussion: *Whether,* above all else, the way that evolution has happened up till now, as has been ascertained, and which can explain the *small* evolutionary jumps ["micro-evolution" that is, the origin of races within the bosom of one species; or of species among their own kindred]; *whether* these may be sufficient to explain the *grand* course evolution takes, as it is revealed by Paleontology; *whether,* that is, these "jumps" may be able to explain the origin of the big groupings [i.e., "macro-evolution"] (p. LXIV).

To be sure, Montalenti leaves the question open! The form his admission takes is that of a problem. But what is the substance? The question to start with was: *do* mutations prove that one species

---

the probative value of the argument from Paleontology as far as it concerns man: "The manifold researchers of Paleontology . . . have not up to the present produced anything positively clear and certain. . . ." (Pius XII, *Allocutio ad Membra Acad. Scientiarum,* November 30, 1941: *AAS,* XXXIII [1941], 506.) The English translation given here is from the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* April, 1953.

can change into another? We must emphasize again that *in the present stage of science* the reply to the question is *negative.*

That answer is stunningly negative. Mutations are "casual; non-orientated"; Paleontology is consistent and patterned. The two trends are contradictory; and you cannot explain the facts of Paleontology by mutations.

To return now to Darwin. In a passage we have cited he says: "Since natural selection works exclusively by means of and for the good of each several being, therefore every quality whether of body or mind will tend toward perfection."

Now words are signs of thought. They are "conventional signs" and when they have acquired one meaning, they may be expected to signify that meaning when they are used (unless some other is clear). And such is the case with natural selection.

Darwin has said: "natural selection *works,*" (emphasis added). This statement conveys the idea of a "principle," a "force" that is operating. But this is *not* the meaning of *natural* selection! We gave natural selection the best interpretation possible, and even then we saw that it could not have the *force* which Darwin attributed to it. Now we are disabused entirely. For it does not mean a principle, an operating force at all. As Montalenti concludes:

> Darwin defends himself vigorously . . . against the accusation that with his "natural selection" he introduced the concept of that kind of *personified force* to which many of the vitalists appeal. No. "Selection" is a convenient name to indicate the results of the game of the laws of nature, those of development and those of the struggle for existence (p. XXVII).

Selection being only a *result* and not an operating cause, it does *not* give us the key to the constant progression from the lower to the higher which Paleontology manifests. Yet this has to be explained, for nothing else has succeeded where mutations have failed. Nor is selection the key to the "laws of nature," which are already in the game. These "laws" also are not operating forces at all. They are just *verbal expressions* to indicate the happy rapport which goes on constantly between phenomena and the world around.

The meanings of words being thus clarified; and the terms understood, we come to this conclusion: selection does *not* work either *for* the good or *against* the good of the organism. It does

not "work" at all! Modern evolutionistic geneticists have striven to devise ways to prove the theory of Darwin, but their scientific explanations leave us profoundly unconvinced. As one can see, Darwinian theory is not sustained by scientifically demonstrated facts. In its historical context, it is untenable because it is materialistic. We might seek a way out for Darwin the man if we could; but we will have to be honest. Speaking of the influence of environment in one passage, Darwin says:

> Naturalists always say that external conditions are the only possible cause of variations. In a certain very limited sense this can be true. But it is absurd, for example, to attribute to external conditions only the structure of a wood-pecker with this type of feet; this tail, beek and tongue; all so admirably adapted to snatch up insects from under the bark of trees (p. 17).

Well said! But if it is absurd to attribute to environment only the structure of a woodpecker, it is more absurd to attribute to environment alone the marvellous structures, all of them, as they appear in the development of living forms. Why not let the organisms themselves contribute something to this development? and as *principles of operation* in their own evolution? Then if you insert here "those diverse powers impressed by the Creator" in one or a few forms of the primitive organisms (p. 524), these indeed could be the true cause of the evolution of species.

I regret to have to say that such an interpretation is in contrast, not so much with the words, but certainly with the mentality of Darwin; with his anti-finalism; with his insuperable repugnance to calling into action, as Montalenti says, "forces, or impulses, or tendencies or superior designs."

Therefore we arrive at this final conclusion: The Darwinian *theory* remains insufficient to explain the evolution of species, supposing that evolution did take place.[9] The causes of evolution, the modalities, the ways and mechanisms, indicated by Darwin, and developed, if you will, over the century, do not stand up under criticism.

Why should the year 1859 be reckoned "one of the most important in history?" Why should the hundredth anniversary be cele-

[9] This "supposing" is the *fact* of evolution. As it is opposed to a *true* fact of evolution, cf. the *Commentary* below.

brated as marking one of those "grand conquests achieved by the mind of man"? Montalenti exaggerates. But Darwinian theory did generate a current of interest in scientific research, and just praise be to it for that.

G. Bosio, S.J.

Rome, Italy

COMMENTARY ON "REFLECTIONS ON DARWINISM"

The Darwin Centenary, 1859-1959, is now over. Much has been written and much has been spoken during the year which celebrated this Centenary. The central question, however, remains unanswered: "Is evolution a fact?" It is fitting to weigh at this time the various answers to that question proposed during the last year. What has the Darwinian theory over the past hundred years to show for evolution?

It is certain that the Church has made no decision either for or against evolution, "in as far as it inquires into the origin of the human body as coming from pre-existent and living matter. . . ," as Pius XII indicated in *Humani Generis*.[1] With a number of well advised precautions,[2] Pius XII stated that the field is still left open for investigation. This encyclical, in fact, offers a kind of invitation to "try the spirits," and see where we stand, along with a sound directive to proceed in such a way "that the reasons for both opinions, that is, those favorable and those unfavorable to evolution, be weighed and judged with the necessary seriousness, moderation and measure. . . ."[3]

In his "Reflections on Darwinism," Father Bosio has presented an eminently fair analysis of the meaning of this widely celebrated Centenary. Taking the occasion of a new Italian edition of Darwin's work, *The Origin of Species,* published to commemorate the event, he appraises the history of Darwinism, its philosophical import and its scientific status up to the present moment. He arrives at a final judgment, one that is just but tempered as to the man and his doctrine, and without unduly interposing the argument from

[1] Pius XII, *Humani Generis, AAS,* XLII (1950), 575. English translation, NCWC edition, pargh. 36.

[2] *Ibid,* p. 576; pargh. 36: "Some, however, rashly transgress this liberty of discussion, when they act as if the origin of the human body from pre-existing and living matter were already completely certain and proved by the facts which have been discovered up to now and by reasoning on those facts, and as if there were nothing in the sources of divine revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this question."

[3] *Ibid.*

authority. In the end, the "triumph of Darwinism" remains somewhat bereft of the glowing aura with which it is bedecked in certain sectors. Yet for all that, it is given its fair measure of praise.

We may raise the question, however: "Why ask 'if evolution is a fact,' since the answer seems so obvious?" The Century of Darwin has come and gone, and it has left the theory of evolution more or less where it was before, if not further than ever from an overwhelming proof.

Father Bosio has shown that during the Century of Darwin, materialism and evolution have become so intertwined that it is difficult to separate the one from the other. Materialism, however, whether historical or dialectical, *denies the existence of God.* Thus for materialists, evolution *has* to be a "fact." It makes little difference whether proof is at hand, or whether proof (from science worthy of the name) will ever be forthcoming. For those who think this way: cosmic evolution *is* a "fact"; the universe *is* in full evolutionary swing, and man *"still evolves."*

Now when Catholic thinkers and writers use the same terms as the Materialists, they mean to apply them, of course, with the necessary reservations, since, being Catholics, they hold with the Church in philosophy, and they hold with the Church in science. But if the very terms of the materialists are used, without accurate definitions of the concepts involved, and without clearcut distinctions, confusion can arise on these matters which are so important, connected as they are more or less with the truths of faith. By this procedure there is brought into the discussion about evolution an undesirable element; the undue interposition of the argument from authority. It gets entrenched behind a kind of dilemma: either do not query good Catholics, men of reputation, who write this way; or if you do, admit that you are leveling at them the charge of disloyalty to the Church and her teaching. This is why we may ask the question: is evolution a fact?

But there is a way out of the dilemma and it is simple: when speaking or writing of evolution, call it by its name: *a theory.* A liberal use of the two words "if" and "then" will do the trick. Thus: "If science (Biology, paleontology, etc.) should some day prove that one species can change into another, then there will be more argument in favor of evolution." "If the production of man's body from pre-existing and living matter were a fact, then these

brilliant new lights could be brought to play on the theology of the Incarnation, on Church-state relations, etc."

The spirit of Rome is the spirit of truth. The gods of ancient mythology, the tritons, the muses are welcome there; everything of the past, the real past, that is, which is a tribute to the genius of man . . . the forums and palaces of the Caesars who once trounced the Christians, the temples of their deities, all are tended and guarded jealously, by the people and their government, in a culture which abounds, too, with art and architecture inspired by the genius of the Catholic faith. Other peoples in a moment of hysteria have brought to ruin the record of their own greatness, and regret that it was done.

At the center of this all-embracing spirit of Rome there stands the Chair of Peter which diffuses its spirit with steady light. It embraces all that is valid: the past, the present, the future. Certain it is that the Popes through the ages have been most responsible for Rome's greatness today, as a center of the *real:* that which is, or came to be; that which enjoyed the spark of divine life, of being; that which is therefore true and beautiful. In this way also will Rome meet the fact of evolution when it is solidly established.

WILLIAM M. AGNEW, S.J.

Collegio Bellarmino
Rome, Italy

AVIGNON: A CITY OF GHOSTS

There are places which, having known an eventful and stormy history, retain an atmosphere of their own and seem to belong still to a bygone age. It is as though the lives of their former dwellers, lived intensely for good or evil, have generated some mysterious influence which survives them. Such is the city of Avignon. It is quiet enough today and the ordinary tourist rarely lingers long there, but behind its walls reared by Popes, its papal palace, its churches, its narrow, hilly streets, and its old houses there seems to pulsate still the colorful, often far from edifying, life of the fourteenth century; a period which had such detrimental results to Holy Church that the "Babylonish Captivity," as men called it, is reckoned one of the most serious remote causes of the Reformation.

Originally an important town of Gallia Narbonensis, its history was chequered. Usually it belonged to the Empire, but local wars were many and the French kings were always anxious to annex it. It had a short life as a republic, it was ruled in turn by the Counts of Toulouse and Provence, and eventually came into the clutches of the rulers of Naples, whose notorious queen, Joan, sold it to Pope Clement VI in 1348.

When, in 1305, the French cardinal, Bertrand de Goth, became Pope Clement V, dreading the disorder and discomfort of contemporary Rome, he was strongly influenced by Philip IV of France —Philip the Fair—then fresh from his struggle with Boniface VIII, and resolved to dominate both Church and State. Hence Clement remained in France, and a few years later took up his residence at the Dominican priory at Avignon. There he died, and his successor, John XXII (1316-1334), showed he meant to settle down by building the sumptuous gothic palace adjoining the cathedral. Of the harm thus wrought to Christendom, the amazing conflicts between sin and sanctity, the eventual return of Gregory XI to the Eternal City, and the fresh disaster of the Great Schism, let history tell.

The beautiful old city is all up and down. Its highest ridge, towering above the Rhone, is crowned by the imposing mass of the cathedral and the palace, now surrounded by boulevards where the traveller looks down to the swiftly flowing river and the famous

Pont d'Avignon of our early French lessons. Up to 1177 all attempts to bridge the Rhone had failed; then upon a day came Bénézet, the young shepherd, to tell the Bishop that it had been shown to him in a vision that God willed a bridge to be built and that this time it would stand. The bridge was built in eight years by means of alms—since such a work was one of charity and public utility. Originally it had nine arches, but today only four remain, together with the little gothic chapel (dedicated to St. Nicholas, Patron of sailors and boatmen) in which St. Bénézet was originally buried.

The cathedral of *Notre Dame-des-Doms* (a strange dedication, never satisfactorily explained) dates from long before the papal residence, and is in the Romanesque style of the region, but quite devoid of external ornament, and with a solid square tower, lightened only slightly by a pinnacle supporting a statue of Our Lady. Within, it is comparatively small and, though it contains some later embellishments, it is quite incongruous as a papal cathedral. Yet its atmosphere is indefinable. It is not Roman, but it is certainly not French. It seems almost moribund, but what life remains is alien; a strange, cosmopolitan survival! Portraits of the Avignon popes, all striking and even handsome men, deck its walls and there are a few good pictures. John XXII rests in an ornate gothic tomb, and Benedict XII in a plainer one, considerably damaged.

The palace was long left to decay and during the French Revolution was put to various uses, but it is now recognized as a national monument, and has been restored. Though severe externally, with its crenellated, square towers and rather grim walls, it is a stately pile, and memories crowd upon the historically-minded visitor. Popes, princes, poets, artists, curial clergy, and at least one saint have trodden these pavements, stood in these sumptuous halls. None of the Popes were bad men; some were decidedly good: keen on missionary enterprise, admirers and even friends of saints, founders of religious houses. But they were weak, vacillating, comfort-loving, and wholly under French domination. Hence, nepotism, injustice, crooked dealing, and worse, as witness the infamously conducted suppression of the Templars. Long neglect has caused the frescoes in the halls and chapels to fade and perish, but there is one great audience chamber, in simple gothic style. It is there that John XXII pronounced the allocution for the canonization of

St. Thomas Aquinas. Yet it is impossible to forget that that palace saw also the worldliness and sometimes the wickedness which so horrified St. Catherine of Siena. In one chapel is a cenotaph to that complex figure, the Spanish Cardinal Gil d'Albornoz whose tomb is in the Toledo cathedral. He it was who was sent to Rome to restore order by Innocent VI, and was, at least temporarily, a patron of Rienzi.

We descend by steps to the lower city. Old churches, like Saint Agricole and Saint Didier, dedicated to the early Roman bishops, invite one to linger. Exactly opposite the former, in the steep and narrow street, a quiet hotel (itself a jumble of old and modern buildings) holds a sadder relic of mediaeval days. Its dining room is a fine, vaulted, gothic chamber, some say a former chapel, of the Templars' Preceptory that once stood here. What was the fate of the sometime occupants? Somewhere hereabouts lived Laura de Noves, later wife of Hugh of Saxony, who was born, lived and died—of the "Black Death"—in Avignon, and for some time Petrarch himself settled in the city.

Truly, Avignon is a city of ghosts, but to reach their favorite haunts we must cross the Rhone and visit the amazing collection of ruins and slums, Villeneuve-lez-Avignon.

The "new town" grew up around the sixth century Benedictine abbey of St. Andrew, and was formally established in the thirteenth century. During the "Captivity" the cardinals lived there, and we find considerable remains of one of their palaces; but for the most part the place is a mass of weed-covered fallen masonry. The *Place* is silent and deserted, and the shops few and poor.

Conspicuous is the fourteenth century fortress of St. Andrew. Its grim, crenellated, round towers and part of the walls are still well preserved, as are certain chambers inside and the prison cells used as late as post-Revolution days. The remains of the monastery, including those of a Romanesque chapel, are close by, but scanty. On a higher slope stands the later fortress builty by Philip the Fair to overawe the Pope. It is a tall, square tower, suggestive of a Scottish border "Peel," with a few loopholes and windows high above the ground. In mediaeval days it would have been very difficult to capture.

Villeneuve contains a small hospital, formerly an enclosed convent belonging to some branch of the Franciscan Order, in the

former chapel of which stands the fine gothic tomb monument of Innocent VI. It resembles that of John XXII in the cathedral, but on inspection it may be noted that it merely stands on the floor. As the neighboring Charterhouse, founded by that Pope, contains a chapel bearing his name, it seems probable that the tomb has been moved from there. The religious who now run the hospital show also an interesting portrait: that of St. Roseline, cousin of St. Elzear of Sabran and his wife, St. Delphine. She belonged to the neighborhood of Villeneuve and is one of the few members of the Carthusian Order raised to the honors of the altar.

A small church, once collegial, dates from earlier days, but is bare save for one artistic gem, normally kept under lock and key: an ivory Madonna and Child, carved in one piece from an elephant's tusk, and of exquisite workmanship. The last and saddest sight is the Carthusian monastery of *Val de Bénédiction,* originally dedicated to St. John the Baptist, and founded by Étienne Aubert (Innocent VI) in 1356. Perhaps he and his family thought some reparation was called for, and obviously the foundation was a noble one, despite its deplorable condition today.

Apart from some nepotism, Innocent is considered one of the best of the Avignon popes, and his foundation charter shows that he was generous to the Order whose grand boast is that it has never been reformed because never deformed: *Nunquam reformata quia nunquam deformata.* At the Revolution it was dissolved and left to ruin.

The magnificent Renaissance entrance remains, and leads into what was once the great cloister. It is now roofless and has lost its walls, but the characteristic Carthusian cells open off from it and are exposed to full view: small four-roomed cottages, with outside staircases, though these must once have been sheltered by the little entrance porches opening off the cloister. At the far end is the once obviously beautiful church, rather Italian in style and formerly richly frescoed. It is only a shell but roofed and quite well preserved, and Mass has been, and is, celebrated in many a worse place. Though choir and chapels are stripped of furniture, the screen separating the choir of the Fathers from that of the lay-brethren remains. In the chapel named for Innocent VI is a fine fresco of Urban V, in good condition. He wears tiara and cope and in his left hand holds a long, unrolled scroll, covered with lettering

now no longer decipherable. It is impossible not to wonder how heavily the prayers of the monks must have weighed in the balance and brought at length the end of the fatal period of "Captivity" and Schism. It was at Villeneuve that the French envoys announced to the Antipope, Benedict XII (the Spaniard Pedro de Luna), that France had renounced him and was returning to her obedience to the rightful Pontiff.

Avignon seems left over from the past. Its present inhabitants scarcely seem to count. The men and women of the days of "the Avignon Popes" retain their citizen rights.

MONIALIS

Stanbrook Abbey
Worcester, England

JOHN MOSCHUS: MONK MARIAN WITNESS

Religious life today among men and women finds one of its chief glories in devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary. It has ever been so in the history of the higher life. In the beginning when organized forms of religious life were yet unknown, St. Ambrose proposed Mary as the great model of virginal souls.[1] In our days religious families, whether especially dedicated to her or not, vie with one another to glorify their common Mother. In medieval monasteries the love of Mary, developed through the early centuries of monasticism, grew to full flower. The evening *Salve* of the Cistercians after the long day's labor remains a beautiful reminder and symbol of a time bubbling over with enthusiastic love for Mary.

Yet documents attesting devotion to Mary in the early stages of monastic life do not abound. One of the voices of early monasticism that does ring out strong and clear is that of John Moschus, who lived most of his life in the latter part of the sixth century (c. 545-c. 619). He wrote his *Spiritual Meadow* to describe the monks he knew and the life he lived. Happily a Marian note of this work affords us a precious insight into the role that Mary must have played in the lives of the monks of his time.

The *Spiritual Meadow* consists of a series of charming stories about the monks, without being a unified treatise. Taken together the incidents give a general impression of contemporaneous religious life in much the same way as the *Vitae Patrum* and the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius (c. 367- c. 430).

Among these elements Mary is not forgotten. A number of incidents concern her. These references to Mary are all the more remarkable in as much as John Moschus wrote his famous work about seventy-five years (c. 615) after the death of St. Benedict, who does not even mention Mary in his rule.[2] There is the story of the candle kept burning miraculously, a variation of which exists

[1] Pourrat, *La Spiritualité Chrétienne* (Paris: Lecofere, 1921), I, 230; C. Neumann, *The Virgin Mary in the Works of St. Ambrose* (Unpublished thesis: University of Fribourg, 1954), pp. 33 ff.

[2] This is said not to suggest that the Benedictines have been found wanting in love for our Lady. It was St. Benedict who introduced the *Magnificat* into the hour of Vespers. St. Odilon used to prostrate himself on the floor at the words *"Tu ad liberandum hominem non horruisti virginem."* Benedictines

in other traditions.[3] A certain monk, John, lived in a grotto about twenty miles from Jerusalem. He cherished there an image of "our most holy and Immaculate Queen Mary, Mother of God, and ever Virgin." Each time he was about to set out on a pilgrimage he lighted a candle as he was accustomed to do before the image. His pilgrim's staff was often in his hand. He made one such journey every year, to the Holy places, to Mt. Sion, to the shrines of the martyrs, even when these were distant, even as far away as Ephesus. Before leaving, he would light a candle and on his knees pray God to direct him on his way. Turning towards the image of Our Lady, he would say: "Holy Queen, Mother of God, I am going on a long trip, which will last many days. Watch yourself over your candle and take care of it as I would, that it go not out." Whenever he came back, be the time of his absence two, three, five or even six months, he found his candle still burning in Mary's honor, not a whit smaller.[4]

Now whatever a critical modern reader may say of the legendary character of this narration, it does charm by the warm delicacy and unadorned simplicity. If one grant that the story is the pious affusion of a too ardent soul, its very existence testifies to a tender devotion towards Mary. Pious souls still honor her by a burning candle. If the story be fabricated by John Moschus or one of his friends, the account demands and presupposes a remarkable Mariology. His account, moreover, has actuality, if considered in the light of the allusion made by Pius XII in his consecration of the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary: "Give peace to peoples separated by error and discord, especially those who profess a particular devotion to you and among whom there is not a house which

still bow at these words. Cf. D. Ph., "Le culte de Marie et les Bénédictins," *Revue Liturgique et Monastique* (1922), p. 247; R. P. Bernard, "Le dévotion Mariale dans l'Ordre de St. Benoît," *Bulletin de la Société Française D'Études Mariales* (1937), pp. 95-121—especially pp. 108-110; J. Leclercq, "Dévotion et théologie Mariales dans le monachisme Bénédictin," in *Marie* (Directeur: P. Du Manoir, S.J.), II, 547-578—especially p. 550.

[3] Morton, *Traveller in Spain* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1955), pp. 274-275. Cf. also Theodore, *Inventio vestis B.V.M. ejusque depositio in Blachemis:* ". . . they ordered . . . the treasure to be guarded and honored without interruption by lamps burning for the glory and honor of the relic of the pure Virgin . . ." (Wenger, p. 297). This document (c. 620-625) is contemporary with the *Spiritual Meadow* (c. 615).

[4] *PG:* 87-3, 3051-52, Cap. 180.

had not your venerable Icon."[5] Somehow John Moschus' story is another reason for confidence that Mary, who appreciates every little thing done in her honor, will stand by Russia and bring it back to Christ.

There are elements important for a history of Mariology in this account of the votive candle burning perpetually before Mary's Icon. Particularly interesting is the title *déspoina*—Lady, Sovereign, or Queen—which he gives her.[6]

Over and over again in his Marian accounts he calls her by the name *déspoina: Domina, Notre-Dame.* In classical Greek *déspoina* designates the "lady of the house," "mistress" in the sense of the Latin *Domina.* At Byzantium *déspoina* acquired the meaning of "Empress," and in Greek ecclesiastical literature it is applied especially to the Blessed Virgin. In one of the proems of the celebrated Hymn *Akathistos, déspoina* is translated "Lady," and the proper name for queen *(basilís)* is employed.[7] But even the Latin *Domina* expresses complete sovereignty. Vergil, for example, applied the name to the goddess Cybele: *". . . et iuncti currum dominae subiere leones."*[8] It is particularly noteworthy that John Moschus uses *déspoina* in conjunction with *theotókos:* Mother of God. Whether he was conscious of it or not, he was giving the dogmatic ground for Our Lady's Queenship. Apparently the two titles, Queen and Mother of God, go hand in hand in Greek theological and devotional language.[9]

Déspoina says even more than *Basilís* in Byzantine literature. The word "Empress" connotes greater power than "queen." The Byzantines extended the feminine form of *despótēs*—the name reserved for the Emperor—to his wife and mother. Christ, too, is

[5] *AAS,* XXXIV (1942), 346.

[6] Antoine Wenger, A.A. *(L'Assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition Byzantine du VI^e au X^e siècle)* translates "Maria, hē adelphē hēmōv kai déspoina" as "Marie qui est notre soeur et notre souveraine."

[7] *Uffizio Dell'Inno Akathistos:* Τῇ βασιλίδι Μητρί (Grottaferrata, 1949), p. 10: καῖρε . . . Δέσποινα; *Iibid.,* p. 11. Cf. also G. G. Meersseman, O.P., *Der Hymnos Akathistos im Abendland* (Freiburg, Switzerland, 1958), p. 37; Henri Barré, "La royauté de Marie pendant les neuf premiers siècles," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (1939), pp. 133-139.

[8] *Aeneid,* III: 113.

[9] St. John Damescene, *Hom. II in dormitionem B.V.M.:* "Thou dost reign in the royal palace of heaven, Queen [*Basilís*], Mistress [*kyría*], Sovereign [*déspoina*], Mother of God [*theomētēr*], the true God-Bearer [*theotókos*] . . ."

called *despótēs,* and the step of applying the corresponding feminine form to His Mother is natural. By the same principle of analogy, *despótēs* came to designate the Emperor's courtiers, but the feminine form remained restricted to the Empress and the Emperor's mother. Thus the word *despótēs* assumes in the course of time a dignity undreamed of in the beginning, when it meant the "master of slaves."

Then the word *Kýrios* expressed the relation between the head of the house, his wife and his children. Despite the fact that Byzantine emperors were called *despótēs,* the Roman Emperors are called *Basileùs* or king.[10] The interchangeable use of the words *déspoina, despótēs,* for *basílissa* and *Basileùs* is brought out in the splendid close of the discourse of John the Geometrician (c. 950). In his peroration he exalts Mary as Co-redemptrix and Queen of the Universe.[11] He addresses Christ: "We thank Thee, O Lord [*déspota*], and Dispenser of all these mysteries and above all for having chosen such a woman to be their minister." Then he turns to Mary: "We thank thee, Sovereign Mistress [*déspoina*], for the toils and sufferings endured for us up to this hour." Further on in the same conclusion he speaks to her: "Now that thou art established Queen [*Basílissa*] at the right hand of the King [*Basileùs*]. . . ."[12]

The Icon of Mary forms the center of a curious story which could be entitled: *Impurity or Iconoclasm—which?* The devil of impurity was waging war against a certain monk, celebrated for his asceticism. Practically exhausted, in desperation the monk asked the devil, "When will you leave me in peace?" The devil appears and exacts an oath from him to keep secret the answer he was

---

PG: 96, 719. Also Theodore, *Inventio vestis B.V.M.,* No. 11, 12, 13, 15 (Wenger edition, pp. 300-303). Origen also used the word *"Kyría": Hom. in Lucam, PG:* 13, 1901-1902. Cf. in addition: *Paraclesis in onore della SS. Madre di Dio:* ἐνδόξου Δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου . . . μνημονεύσαντες (Grottaferrate, 1945), p. 3; and H. Barré, *op. cit.,* pp. 147-162.

[10] Hen. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Paris, 1831-1833): the words βασιλεὺς, βασιλίς, δέσποινα, δεσπότης and Passow, *Griechisches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1847), Volume V.

[11] Wenger, *op. cit.,* p. 192; also St. Germanus, *In Praesentationem Deiparae I, PG:* 98, 303, 315.

[12] John the Geometrician, *Laus in Dormitionem B.V.M.,* No. 59-61 (Wenger edition, pp. 406-409).

about to hear. The monk swears. The devil's secret is an avowal of the Proto-evangelium: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman." Even her Icon hurts him. "Venerate no more this Icon," which portrayed "Our Lady Mother of God, Mary, carrying Our Lord Jesus Christ." The monk begs for time to weigh the devil's proposition. The day after, he tells all to the Abbot Theodore. Theodore gives him a piece of advice that is at first startling. It would be better, he advises, to visit all the brothels in town than give up honoring Our Savior Jesus Christ and His Mother. Yet his advice is sound, confirming as it does the conviction of Christians that Mary is the Refuge of Sinners. She has often reclaimed a sinner, but if faith in her is lost, to whom shall he go?[13]

Another story of the *Spiritual Meadow* exemplifies the antiphon and teaching of the Church that Mary is the irresistible Victress over heresy and error. "Rejoice, O Virgin Mary, for thou alone has destroyed all heresies in the world." There is a dogmatic explanation to show how this antiphon expresses a profound truth and there is an historical argument to the same end,[14] but John Moschus presents the truth in a novel way. Near the city of Hieropolis, there was a column-sitter whose faith was not orthodox.[15] The pious Bishop Ephrem, the patriarch of Antioch, went to the scene of this stylite's exhibition to see if he could convert him from the sect of Severus and of the Acephalists. This latter group had broken off from another and had associated with Severus. But whatever be the various shades of these sects, they all taught that in Christ there is but one nature. The saintly Ephrem invited the

[13] *PG:* 87-3, 2899-2900, No. 45. This is a classic example of Mary's role in the conversion of sinners. Cf. *Vita Mariae Aegypti, PG:* 87-3, 3714, 3715, 3718.

[14] Joseph C. Fenton, *Studies in Praise of Our Blessed Mother* (Washington, D. C., Catholic University of America Press, 1952), pp. 231-243; Brou, "Addendum," *Ephemerides Liturgiae*, 65 (1951), 28-33; and "Marie Distructrice de toutes les hérésies et la belle legende du repons: Gaude Maria Virgo," *Ephemerides Liturgiae, 62* (1948), 321-353.

[15] Rouët de Journal suggests that the emphasis on the polemical side is due to the hand of John's faithful companion, Sophronus the Sophist, later Archbishop of Jerusalem, who in his zeal for pure doctrine inserted these anti-heretical incidents to demonstrate how the monks took part in the battle against the enemies of orthodoxy: *John Moschus Le Pré Spirituel* (Cerf, 1946), p. 29.

stylite to join the Apostolic See of Rome. The stylite refused saying, "I will not put myself in communion with the Synod." He was referring undoubtedly to the Council of Chalcedon. To the bishop's remonstrance that the Church is without error, he proposed the test of fire so much esteemed and so much in vogue in many generations and in divers places as a proof of orthodoxy. To save the soul of his adversary, Bishop Ephrem accepted the challenge. When the fire was raging, the stylite refused to come down to pass through the fire. The bishop took off his omophorion, a vestment worn about the neck, whose ends fall to the knees in much the same fashion as a Roman stole. Approaching the fire, he prayed: "Lord Jesus Christ, one God, who hast deigned for us to take true flesh of the Holy Queen Mary, Mother of God, and ever Virgin, show us the truth." He then cast his omophorion, in the fire. It remained untouched in the flames for three hours. It was lifted from the ashes unharmed. Happily the stylite recognized his error and received communion from the hands of the blessed Ephrem, giving glory to God.[16]

There is a reason why Ephrem prayed as he did. Clearly the unity of the person of Christ is clearly stressed, together with the sacred humanity of Christ: "true flesh of Our Holy Queen Mary"; and likewise the divine nature is indicated by "Mother of God." Here in this prayer is the complete rejection of the monophysite heresy, and an example of the truth of the Church's antiphon, thou hast conquered all heresies.

Mary's same enmity for heresy is emphasized in two other recitals. A certain priest-monk, Cyriac, beheld in a dream an august woman standing outside his cell. She was clothed in royal purple accompanied by St. John the Evangelist and St. John the Baptist. He went out and invited her inside. She refused to enter. Again and again he implored her to enter, using for the purpose the persuasive language of the psalms. Finally the woman answered severely: "My enemy is in your cell. How can I enter?" She disappeared and Cyriac awoke troubled. His conscience assured him he had done nothing to offend her. No one was in his cell, of that he was sure. To forget his troubles he takes up a book he had borrowed from a priest of Jerusalem, named Hesychius. On opening the book, his eyes fell upon the appendix which contained two

[16] *PG:* 87-3, 2883-2886, Cap. 36.

sermons of Nestorius. He understood that this was the enemy meant by "Our Lady, Mother of God." Immediately he went and returned the book to Hesychius, saying, "This book has harmed me more than it has helped me." On hearing why, Hesychius tore out the two sermons and cried: "May the enemy of Our Lady, Mother of God and always Virgin have no place in my cell."[17] This anti-Nestorian incident harmonizes with the entire tenor of the *Spiritual Meadow*. John Moschus has the spirit of a great inquisitor. He is ever on the watch to hunt down Nestorians and the followers of Severus of Antioch. At least a dozen of his stories have for object heresy, the sin which is the authentic fornication.[18]

Probably the same Cyriac, the hero of the preceding account, shines in another anti-Nestorian incident. A monk, Theophane, troubled by temptations against purity visited Cyriac for direction and comfort. All went well, until the monk mentioned he was a Nestorian. Cyriac stiffened immediately and threatened him: "Salvation is impossible without the orthodox faith and belief in the Holy Virgin, Mary, Mother of God." The monk answered that all heretics say the same thing, that they are right. As for himself, he is confused and cannot tell where the truth lies. Cyriac invites him to remain in his own cell. He leaves and prays on the shore of the Dead Sea. The following day a terrifying individual leads the visiting monk to a dark, foul den, raging with fire. He points out in the fire Nestorius, Theodore (Mopsuestia), Eutyches and Appolonius, Evagrius and Didimus, Discorus and Severus, Arius and Origen. "This is the place prepared for heretics and those who blaspheme against the Mother of God and for all those who follow their doctrines." Theophane, converted, remained with Cyriac, passed the rest of his days there and died in peace.[19]

Such a story, together with the one we entitled *Impurity or Iconoclasm—which?* suggest that Mary is triumphant power over the demon of impurity. Besides, this last incident underlines the truth that devotion to Mary is a pledge of orthodoxy and a guarantee of salvation.

In all the instances cited here, Mary crushes heresy, but converts the heretic. Here is another. A certain woman, follower of the heretic Severus (acephali), obtained permission from the Guardian

[17] *Ibid.*, 2899-2902, Cap. 46.
[18] *Ibid.*, 3065-3066, Cap. 188.
[19] *Ibid.*, 2871-2874, Cap. 26.

of the Holy Sepulchre to pass the night in venerating the tomb of Christ. As she tries to enter, she is met by Our Lady, the Holy Mother of God, and a chorus of attendant women. "Since you are not one of us," said the Mother of God, "you cannot enter here." The woman demanded entrance: "Believe me, woman, you shall not enter here unless you are in communion with us." The woman repented, received communion and was admitted to venerate the life-giving tomb of our Savior Jesus Christ.

But some sinners have to learn the hard way. Here is one. An actor, by name Gaianus, blasphemed the Mother of God. She appeared to him and asked him, "What evil have I done you that you blaspheme me?" His answer was more blasphemy. Again she appeared to him and begged him not to harm his soul. He refused to amend and continued to blaspheme her. She appeared one day for the third time. She said nothing. She merely cut off both his hands and feet by tracing a circle around the limbs with one of her fingers. Finally converted, the actor acknowledged his sin publicly. The short comment of Moschus proves that here again Mary acted out of love and mercy for the blasphemer's soul: "And he confessed out of love."[20]

All the accounts about Mary have some doctrinal content, or witness some truth of Mariology. Here is a monk who would say with St. Bernard: "All good things have come to me with Mary." Mary is God's almoner, Catholic tradition asserts. Though this saying is meant in the spiritual order, this monk knew her also in the literal sense of the title almoner. Leontius, for this was his name, out of love for our Lady never left the Church of St. Mary's the New at Jerusalem for about forty-five years.[21] He was the soul of charity. He never let his beneficiaries know the source of his charities. The blind could not see him, so it was safe to give them alms directly, from hand to hand. They would never recognize him. Other poor people received their alms indirectly. He put what he intended to give before them so they could not miss the gift, or at the base of a column or on a bench or even on the steps leading up to the sanctuary. One day a monk asked him: "Father,

[20] *Ibid.*, 2901-2902, Cap. 47.

[21] St. Mary the New was dedicated in 543 A.D. One of the celebrated churches dedicated to Mary in Rome bears the same name: *Santa Maria Nuova.*

why do you not put the alms directly in the hands of the poor?" "Excuse me, Father," he answered, "but it is not I who give, but Our Lady, the Mother of God, who nourishes me and others."[22]

Mary appears to a certain mother to teach the Christian lesson, "that charity covers a multitude of sins." Not only is she God's almoner, but she rewards and protects those whom she uses to distribute her alms. The mother in question used to visit the Church of Our Lady to beg with tears the same favor: "Revenge me on the Emperor Zenon." He, it seems, had ravished her daughter. Finally the Mother of God deigned to appear to her, perhaps to soften the refusal, and said: "Often I have wished to avenge you, but his hand prevents me." John Moschus gives the necessary explanative note, "For he was very charitable."[23]

Our final story illustrates that Mary never fails to protect those who confide themselves to her with faith. A benefactor of many monks had to go on a business trip. As he was about to leave, his wife protested: "In whose protection do you leave your wife and little girl?" He commended them he said, "To Our Lady, Mother of God." A certain day during his absence a servant resolved to stab mother and child. Leaving the kitchen with a knife, he stopped at the dining room door, struck blind. Unable to enter, he called to the mother to come to him. She was puzzled and refused to go to him. She refused also his request to send her daughter. Aware of the hopelessness of his position, the servant stabbed himself.[24]

An early seventh century document which testifies so clearly to the Mother of God's power as God's almoner, her authority over men, to her sinlessness, to the veneration due to her icon, to her protection of her devotees, to her solicitude to defend the Catholic Faith and to lead heretics to the Church, to her Queenship by the continuous repetition of the title Lady in conjunction with her Divine Maternity, which is the basis of her queenship, is truly a witness of an early generation that is worthy to be heard.

VINCENT VASEY, S.M.

Marianist Seminary
Fribourg, Switzerland

[22] *PG:* 87-3, 2913-2914, Cap. 61.
[23] *Ibid.*, 3013-3014, Cap. 175.
[24] *Ibid.*, 2927-2928, Cap. 75.

THE SEMINARY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

A seminary may manage to keep the public out of the seminary, but it cannot hope to keep the seminary out of the public. Restrictions on visits and excursions may keep the residents of the seminary away from the public and public affairs. It is possible to regulate matters so that those in the seminary are aware only of life in the seminary and within a carefully measured ecclesiastical world. But the reversal cannot be effected, at least not by seminary authorities. No similar restrictions can be put on the public that surrounds the seminary. People cannot help knowing that a seminary exists in their community. They cannot help having an opinion of seminary life.

It is quite possible that unrealistic and peculiar views of the local "priest-factory" be circulated. Even Catholics do not automatically have accurate concepts of a seminary.

If there is to be an understanding, a mutual trust, between the seminary and its neighbors, the seminary must take the initiative. There is no other source for interpreting the seminary to the community.

Seminary public relations has a basic kinship with the public relations of any Catholic institution. The ultimate aim in both cases is apostolic. The individual differences of practice may best be illustrated by recounting what has been done in one particular seminary and what long range appraisals and ambitions may be seen in the public relations program of that seminary.

Saint Mary's Seminary is located in the fringe area of Norwalk, Connecticut, a city of some forty thousand people. At one time the locale of the seminary could be called rural. Now it may more aptly be described as graciously suburban. The ninety acres of seminary property would easily be considered a tourist's delight, if tourists were given their way. The property contains three lakes, rustic fields, stone fences, many wooded paths and hidden shrines.

For eleven priests, forty major seminarians, and five lay brothers this seminary is home. For over fifty years this seminary has trained priests for the American Province of the Holy Ghost Fathers. This congregation is devoted to a variety of missionary, educational and parochial activities.

Norwalk is a melting pot of old time Yankees, New York exurbanites, writers, and entertainment folk, with a generous sprinkling of Hungarian, Negro, Irish, and Italian residents. It is a mixed-up town, a moving town, a hard-to-understand sort of town.

In some way there is a civic unity and pride in spite of the religious, social, national and economic diversity. For the most part though, the central core of civic movement is made up of the native sons. This core is largely a white, Protestant, elite.

Now, how does the seminary fit into this? The basis of public relations in the seminary rests on the obligation it has to make itself known. This implies a confidence in itself, the certitude that information on the seminary, if fair and without exaggeration, will make friends for the seminary.

Local parishes, convents, hospitals and academies rely on the ministries of the priests at the seminary. This is indeed a point of contact, an indirect example of the contribution made to the community by the seminary. Often, in a parish for instance, the people do not know that the priest celebrating Mass is a Holy Ghost Father. Usually the stituation is not appropriate for the Father from the seminary to make his identity known. This information is more naturally conveyed through mediums unassociated with priestly sacramental functions.

The seminarians in giving religious instruction classes to public school children have many opportunities to speak of life at the seminary. In discussions on the missions, holy orders, ceremonies, and the religious life, the seminarians have apt occasions for examples taken from their own experience and the experience of their religious society.

Throughout the school year weekend retreats are offered to youth groups from high schools, the Squires, the CYO, and similar sources. The talks and activities are orientated towards the basic question of youth: vocation. In agreeing to come, the boys do not commit themselves in any way; they merely indicate that they want to learn something about the religious life and obtain needed direction.

Once a year, on Departure Day, the general public is invited to visit Ferndale, to tour the house and grounds and to attend the

ceremony of apostolic consecration in which the young priests end their seminary days and enter the active ministry. On this open house day, sawdust carpets are laid on several paths leading to an outdoor altar. These carpets are made of dyed sawdust. The designs are original each time. The priest carrying the Blessed Sacrament is the first person to walk on the carpets.

At the first national meeting of public relations personnel of Catholic institutions, held at Manhattan College this past August, one prominent idea was repeated by all speakers—namely, the need for personal contact with the managers of local communication media. This, of course, is not too revolutionary an idea, but it cannot be overemphasized. In application it has proven beneficial to the information program of St. Mary's Seminary.

Norwalk has its own radio station, daily newspaper and bi-weekly civic events magazine. The reaction of the managers of each of these media has been one of enthusiastic support of seminary participation. The radio station has agreed to broadcast tapes containing group discussions, the chant of the seminary schola, and individual talks on such activities as astronomy, learning the deaf language, and gardening. The newspaper ran almost a full page feature on the seminary, prepared by their own reporters, and has displayed an eagerness for future news. The magazine published an article on a faculty member and his amateur radio work. Another writing on the sawdust carpets is in preparation.

This publicity effort is rightly considered only to be a phase of the full public relations which the seminary adopts as policy. Association with the local media has more value to the seminary than publicity in itself.

The seminarians who engage in the news and feature writing, the recording of tapes, and the preparation of magazine articles are learning, indirectly, that public relations is to be a permanent part of a priest's life. The acceptance of this concept is even more important than the learning of communication skills, for it makes the future priest aware of the public character of his office. False modesty, fear of contact with non-Catholic editors and program directors, and an unholy secrecy about Church affairs have all been foreign to the mission of a priest. A priest, confident of his role

in public relations, will not be timid about exposing himself to possible ridicule by those who do not understand him; he will not look upon a rejection of his writing as an affront to his sacerdotal dignity. He will be a priest of the people. That was why he was ordained. He will be grateful for corrections received from people in radio, TV, newspapers, and other media. Such professional guidance will be regarded as a means of giving clarity to the message he has.

A seminary is more than a house of ecclesiastical studies and spiritual formation. It is that primarily, but it is also an educational institution where young men make achievements in oil painting, photography, athletics, music, microbiology, horticulture, taxidermy, and many other facets of human development. The neighbors of a seminary ought to take a local pride in the fact that a seminary is in their community. This should be true of all residents, no matter what their religion. If such a situation does not prevail, then there is something wrong with the exchange of information from the seminary to the citizenry.

In many instances a seminary is the only institution of higher education in the area. Its potentialities for serving as a center of culture are measureless. Considering the faculty, student body, and the physical plant of any seminary, many intellectual programs must be seen as feasible. To cite just one idea at random, the *disputatio* could be restored to its role as a public—and thereby understandable—debate in philosophy or theology.

Public relations in the seminary is not competition. It is not a fight to get attention away from the Lions, the Chamber of Commerce, the Baptists, or, worse yet, from another Catholic seminary or religious society. It is not a look over the shoulder at who we are passing but a look ahead at where we are going. Dignity, accuracy, and worth must be in everything the seminary does before the public.

People deserve to know about what is helpful to them. A seminary brings the priesthood to society, and through it the sacramental blessings of Christ. A seminary is a center of higher education, teaching the most noble and embrasive of all the liberal arts—theology. A seminary is the source of society's spiritual growth, for from it come the pastors of souls. A seminary is the Church grow-

ing, taking root in the soil of yet another part of the world. A seminary helps people, all people. People deserve to know about it.

WILLIAM JOYCE, C.S.Sp.

Saint Mary's Seminary
Norwalk, Connecticut

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading place in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for July 1910, is accorded to a Latin poem on the Holy Eucharist which the author, Fr. F. K. Reuss, C.SS.R., had presented on the previous Corpus Christi to Pope St. Pius X. . . . Fr. Thomas Reilly, O.P., writing on the "Gift of Tongues" as possessed by the Apostles judges that it meant very probably a natural speaking knowledge of two or more languages or dialects. The charismatic element was the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, impelling them *to speak* in tongues thus known. . . . L. E. Dobrée, under the title "Priest Gordon," narrates the long life of a good Scottish priest who labored zealously in Aberdeen during the first half of the nineteenth century. . . . "Visual Instruction in Christian Doctrine" by Fr. J. McMahon extols the use of lantern slides in the teaching of catechism and in lecturing on the life of Christ. . . . Fr. R. F. O'Connor continues his biography of Père Marie-Antoine, O.F.M.Cap., under the title "A Modern Capuchin.". . . Fr. T. J. McNicholas, O.P., contributes a canonical study of the *sanatio in radice* under the "Ne temere" marriage legislation. . . . The morality of vasectomy imposed by the state in order to cut down the number of defective offspring is discussed in this issue. Fr. E. Rigby, O.P., denies that the civil authority possesses such a power and declares that compulsory sterilization for eugenic reasons is barbaric. Fr. T. Labouré, O.M.I., on the contrary, defends the right of the state to sterilize defectives as a protection of society against the propagation of children likely to have the same defects. . . . Fr. E. Drury makes a plea for more preparatory ecclesiastical seminaries, as being in conformity with the mind of the Church and productive of vocations to the priesthood. . . . Fr. G. Hendricks, of England, suggests as an appropriate place for priests to vacation this year Belgium, with its many spots of interest, particularly because in 1910 the International Exhibition is being held in Brussels.

F. J. C.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

II

The next stage in the development of the devotion to the Sacred Heart must be attributed to the spiritual genius of St. Augustine; it concerns the teaching associated with the opening in the side of Christ.

In this, as in so many other matters, Augustine indicated the main lines which were to be followed in the subsequent tradition of the West. For it is he who first makes the vital connection between the idea of the Church born from the side of Christ on the cross and another concept which has now to be examined in detail.

In his commentary on the passage of *John* 19:34, he finds particular significance in the word *"aperuit,"* which is used in the Latin version of the Gospel, apparently unaware that the Greek word attested by the best manuscripts is *"enuxen"—"transfixit."* Yet, by means of this happy fault he directs our attention, for the first time, from the stream of blood and water flowing without to its hidden source within:

> A watchful word the Evangelist has used, when he says not "Pierced His side," or "Wounded," or anything else, but "Opened": that there a gate of life might be opened, whence the sacraments of the Church have flowed forth, without which there is no entrance to the life that is truly life.[1]

He also elaborates this idea in the same passage, by making a comparison between the wound in Christ's side and the door in the side of the Ark. Nor is this a mere passing comparison: for he returns to it on two occasions in his controversy against Faustus,[2] and it occurs again in the course of his beautiful description of the Ark in the *De Civitate Dei:*

> The Ark is without doubt a figure of the city of God wandering in this world, that is to say, the Church which is saved by means of the wood, on which hung the mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus. . . . And the door it received in its side is surely the wound made

---

[1] *Comm. in Joannem,* tr. CXX, 2: *PL* 35, 1953.
[2] *Contra Faustum,* XII, 8 and 16: *PL* 42, 257 and 261.

in the side of the Crucified when pierced by the lance, by which those enter who come to Him; for from it flowed the sacraments in which believers are initiated.[3]

The direct influence of this idea can, moreover, be clearly seen in the sermon of St. Avitus of Vienne, already quoted:

One of the soldiers, snatching a spear, opened His side. Thus he did not break, nor pierce, nor throttle to death, but (he says) opened; that we might recognize in the gate of life made by this powerful thrust, not the mark of a wound, but the entrance to salvation. For that Ark also, in whose safe protection Noe alone, when all others were perishing, rode the swelling floods of the world and the unchecked triumph of death, is described as being fitted with a door in its side, by which entrance is made to salvation and exit to the light of day. . . . Let us consider, therefore, first what proceeded thence, and next how the Christian enters in.[4]

In a later age, St. Bede as a faithful follower of St. Augustine makes frequent references to the Ark in this connection, as in his *Commentaries on the Hexaemeron and on Genesis,*[5] but he elsewhere alters and enriches the comparison by a preference for the symbolism of the door in the side of Solomon's Temple. Here, for instance, is a passage from his small treatise *De Templo Salamonis:*

The door in the midst of the side was in the right part of the house; for when the Lord died on the cross, one of the soldiers pierced His side with a lance. And appropriately in the right part of the house; since it was His right side that the soldier opened, according to the belief of Holy Church. Here also the Evangelist makes use of an apt word, when he says not "Struck," or "Wounded," but "Opened," that is, the door in the midst of His side, through which the way to heaven might be opened to us.[6]

There is yet a further elaboration of this comparison in the writings of the venerable Doctor, who seems to penetrate more deeply than his predecessors into the opening of the side. The reason for this is precisely his preference for the symbolism of the Temple,

[3] *De Civitate Dei,* XV, 26: *PL* 41, 472.

[4] Avitus, *Sermo de Passione Domini* (frag.): *PL* 59, 312.

[5] *In Hexaemeron,* Lib. II: *PL* 91, 89; and *In Pentateuchum-Genesis,* cc. V-VII: *PL* 91, 223.

[6] *De Templo Salamonis,* VIII: *PL* 91, 753; cf. also *In Libro Regum I,* c. XII: *PL* 91, 722, and *Hom. I,* 22 (in Fer. II Quadr.): *PL* 94, 119.

in which he notices a certain detail which is beautifully described in his *Commentary on the Books of Esdras and Nehemias:*

> The door in the midst of the side was in the right part of the house . . . leading through the interior of the same side by a hidden way to an upper dining-room; for Our Lord and Saviour wished to open for us a gate of salvation in the right side of His Body, so that, washed and sanctified by His sacraments, we might enter the upper room of His heavenly kingdom. For we ascend by the door in the midst of the side to the upper dining-room when, consecrated by the water of baptism and the cup of the Lord, we pass from this earthly conversation to the life of the souls in heaven.[7]

This thought of St. Augustine receives a new development in two sermons which are doubtfully ascribed to the Doctor, though they probably belong to a later period. In them we see more clearly that movement from the exterior to the interior, from the sacraments of blood and water to their source within the opening of the side—a movement which is fundamental to the subsequent growth of devotion to the Sacred Heart.

First, there is a *Sermon to Catechumens on the Symbol,* where, after referring to the Jews who look on the side of Christ without repentance, the preacher says:

> But let their death help towards our salvation. If they despised Him, let us fear Him Who will come to judge us. Let each one hasten while he lives, that he may live; let him run to receive redemption from His precious blood. . . . Here, here, while he lives, let him choose the better place.[8]

The second passage is from the *Sermo de Tempore Barbarico,* in which the language, while based on that of St. Augustine, seems distinctly mediaeval in tone. It has, however, considerable interest in itself, and the word *"foramen"* is particularly to be noticed towards the end of the quotation:

> And now let all come who love Paradise, a place of peace, of security, of perpetual happiness, a place where we will fear no barbarian, endure no adversary, suffer no enemy; come all, enter all; there is a way by which you may enter, the side is open. . . . Strive, says the Lord, to enter by the narrow gate. What is more narrow than that hole

---

[7] *In Esdram et Nehemiam,* II, 7: *PL* 91, 853.
[8] *De Symbolo: Sermo II ad Catechumenos,* VII, 17; *PL* 40, 647.

[*foramen*] which one of the soldiers opened by striking the side of the Crucified? And yet through this narrow hole almost the whole world has entered.[9]

But for the clear expression of this movement we have to turn to the various commentaries on the *Canticle of Canticles* which were being written in the West after the time of St. Augustine—notably by monks of the Order of St. Benedict. Here the relevant text is from *Cant.* 2:14: "My dove in the holes of the rock, in the hollow of the wall." It has a less obvious connection with the Sacred Heart than the passage of St. John's Gospel which we have been considering; but this connection soon came to be made, largely through the influence of St. Augustine.

Reference to commentaries on the *Canticle* written before the time of St. Augustine, such as that of St. Gregory of Nyssa,[10] reveals no sign of this particular interpretation; but the connection is made, apparently for the first time, by Cassiodorus in the sixth century:

The holes in the rock are the wounds which He received on the cross for our salvation, namely the marks of the nails and the blow of the lance. In these holes, then, the dove—that is, the Church—makes her dwelling; for she places all her hope of salvation in the Passion of her Redeemer.[11]

The same identification is made by St. Gregory the Great in his commentary,[12] though he assigns the wound in the side to the "hollow in the wall." Later, St. Bede also takes up the theme in one of his homilies, where he makes an explicit connection with the blood and water flowing from the side of Christ:

The Church is wont to nest in the holes of the rock, in the hollow of the wall. The rock is Christ, Whose hands were pierced with nails on the cross, and Whose side was pierced with a lance, from which there immediately came forth blood and water, that is, the mystery of our sanctification and ablution.[13]

---

[9] *Sermo de Tempore Barbarico,* VII, 9 and VIII, 9: *PL* 40, 706.
[10] *Homiliae in Cantica: PG* 44, 786.
[11] *In Cantica,* II, 14: *PL* 70, 1066.
[12] *Super Cantica Expos.,* II, 15: *PL* 79, 499.
[13] *Hom I,* XI *(in die festo Theophaniae): PL* 94, 62.

Similar ideas are also to be found in the commentary of St. Bede's fellow-countryman, Alcuin of York;[14] while in that of Haymon of Halberstadt in the following century, the exact words of Cassiodorus are repeated without alteration.[15]

THE WOUNDED HEART OF CHRIST

During the Dark Ages, the main interest of ecclesiastical writers was to preserve the tradition of the past—a fact which appears very noticeably in the foregoing commentaries on the *Canticles,* whose authors hardly do more than copy from one another. But when we emerge into the Middle Ages proper (that is, in the twelfth century), we cannot fail to be impressed by the sudden and expansive development of all the ideas we have so far considered.

No longer is the opening in the side of Christ a hidden source about whose nature one can only guess by reflecting on the stream of blood and water proceeding thence. Nor is it merely a refuge in which the Church, like a dove, shelters from the evils that flood the outside world, as in the days of Noe. Rather is it now revealed in its intimate depths, wherein we may behold the very source of light and love in the Heart of God.

Already indeed, in those early commentaries on the *Canticles,* there are a few hints of this new tendency, in connection with the text of *Cant.* 4:9: "You have wounded my heart." Thus Cassiodorus comments as follows:

> When He says that His heart is wounded, He expresses the greatness of the love which He has for His holy Church. . . . Further, the words, "You have wounded My heart," can also be understood of the Passion of Christ: "You have wounded My heart," that is, by your love you have caused Me to be wounded on the cross.[16]

This interpretation, however, does not reappear in the later commentaries, save only in that of Alcuin,[17] who gives it in a much shorter form, and adds nothing new to the idea of Cassiodorus. But it is perhaps the echo of these passages which we hear in the striking words of St. Anselm's *Meditation on the Passion*

[14] *Compendium in Cant.,* II, 14: *PL* 100, 647.
[15] *Enarr. in Cant.,* II: *PL* 107, 307.
[16] *In Cant.,* IV, 9: *PL* 70, 1076.
[17] *Compendium in Cant.,* IV, 9: *PL* 100, 652.

—words which afford a preliminary glimpse of the new mediaeval spirit of devotion:

> Sweet is the opening of His side; for that opening has revealed to us the riches of His goodness, namely the charity of His Heart toward us.[18]

The fuller development of the ideas implicitly contained in the early commentaries on the *Canticle* is, above all, to be found in the *De Anima* of Hugh of St. Victor, who expands them into the characteristically mediaeval devotion to the Wounds of Christ:

> There is a safe and sure rest for weak and sinful men in the wounds of the Saviour. I dwell in them secure; the interior of His heart lies open to me through the wounds [*patent mihi viscera per vulnera*]. Whatever is wanting to me, I take for myself from the heart of my Lord; for His mercies are overflowing, nor are holes [*foramina*] lacking by which they may flow out. Through the holes in the body appear to me the secrets of the heart [*per foramina corporis patent mihi arcana cordis*]; there appears the great mystery of His love, the mercy of our God in which the Orient from on high has visited us.[19]

Thus, Hugh is not content with merely looking on the *"foramina corporis"* from without; but he enters within, and there discovers the *"arcana cordis."* This discovery he was able to communicate to his contemporaries, largely through the incorporation of this part of his *De Anima* in the *Manuale* [or *Mediaeval Book of Devotion*] which came to be ascribed as a whole to St. Augustine.[20]

It is not surprising, therefore, to find his very words reproduced by St. Bernard in the second half of the same century, when he gives his own magisterial commentary on the crucial text of *Cant.* 2:14 in his famous *Sermons on the Canticle*—which represent a real climax of thought and devotion in the Middle Ages:

> Blessed openings, which effect faith in the resurrection and in the divine nature of Christ. "My Lord," he says, "and my God." Whence was obtained this oracle, save from the holes in the rock? In them the sparrow finds a home, and the turtle-dove a nest wherein she may lay her young; in them the dove finds refuge and looks without fear on the hawk hovering above. . . . Truly, where is a safe and sure refuge to be found for the weak, save in the wounds of the Saviour? . . . The

---

[18] *Med. X de Passione Christi: PL* 158, 761.
[19] *De Anima,* Lib. IV, XXI: *PL* 177, 181.
[20] *Manuale: PL* 40, 960.

iron passed through His soul and reached to His heart, so that He cannot now be ignorant of my infirmities. Through the holes in the body appear to me the secrets of the heart; there appears the great mystery of His love, the mercy of our God in which the Orient from on high has visited us. For where could it have been more clearly revealed than in your wounds, that you, O Lord, are gentle and meek and full of mercy?[21]

The following sermon of St. Bernard shows yet a further development of thought, parallel to that which St. Bede had suggested concerning the door in the right side of the Temple. For in this new context of the *Canticle,* he is able to show how rich are the implications contained in this mystery of the side of Christ, through which man ascends from earth to heaven:

The Church is a dove, and therefore she rests; a dove, because innocent and sighing. And she rests in the Word, that is, in the rock; for the rock is the Word. The Church dwells, then, in the holes of the rock, through which she peers in and beholds the glory of her Spouse; yet she is not oppressed by His glory, for she does not appropriate it to herself.[22]

THE THEOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS

St. Bernard has been called the "last of the Fathers," but he also stands at the beginning of the great age of Scholasticism, as the contemporary of Peter Abelard, Hugh of St. Victor, and Peter Lombard—the Master of the *Sentences.* This new age, while containing much that is original, is pre-eminently one of synthesis; and it is not surprising, therefore, to find the different ideas which we have been following singly now placed together in a fuller and more fruitful combination.

Thus in the following century, St. Albert the Great makes more explicit the connection between the idea of the Church, formed from the side of Christ, and the Dove of the *Canticle.* The passage in question is from the *Commentary on St. John's Gospel,* and opens significantly with the very words of St. Augustine:

He pierced His side with a lance, so that the truth might correspond with the shadow; that just as from the side of the sleeping Adam was formed his spouse Eve, so from the side of Christ sleeping the sleep

---

[21] *In Cantica Sermo LXI,* 3, 4: *PL* 183, 1072.
[22] *In Cantica Sermo LXII,* 4: *PL* 183, 1075.

of death on the cross might be formed His spouse, the Church. For this reason He Himself said in *Cant.* 2:14: "My dove in the holes of the rock, in the hollow of the wall." This means the purity and simplicity of the Church, which rests in the holes of the nails through her faith in Christ, Who is the "rock," and in the hollow of the wound in His side, which is the "wall."[23]

From St. Albert we might naturally expect to proceed for a fuller synthesis to his great pupil, St. Thomas, in whose writings we often meet with various of the above-mentioned ideas, particularly with that of the Church formed from the side of Christ.[24] It is, however, not St. Thomas, but his friend and rival, St. Bonaventure, who first gathers together all these ideas and relates them explicitly to the devotion of the Sacred Heart. For in the great age of Scholasticism, he stands out as the great exponent of this devotion; and in its light he makes a synthesis of the three principal stages outlined above: namely, the sacraments of blood and water, the Church formed from the pierced side of Christ, and the secret of His Heart hidden within.

In the first place, he presents the doctrinal synthesis in his treatise on the *Lignum Vitae:*

> In order that the Church might be formed from the side of Christ sleeping on the cross, and that the Scripture might be fulfilled which says: "They shall look upon Him Whom they have pierced," it was ordained by divine providence that one of the soldiers should pierce with his lance and open that sacred side; so that in the blood flowing out with the water, the price of our salvation might be poured forth —thereby from the very source (namely the secret of the Heart) imparting abundant power to the sacraments of the Church for conferring the life of grace, and for bestowing on those who already live in Christ a cup of living water springing up into eternal life. Behold the lance has now made a hole in the rock and a hollow in the wall, as it were a dwelling for doves. Arise, then, beloved of Christ, be like a dove nestling in the opening of the hole; there cease not to watch like the sparrow who has found her home, there like the turtle-dove hide the offspring of your chaste love, there place your mouth to drink water from the sources of the Saviour.[25]

---

[23] *In Joannem,* XIX, 34: Opera, T. XXIV.

[24] Cf. Part I, notes 17 and 40: *AER,* CXLII (1960), 365, 373; also III, q. 66, art. 4, ad 3; *Suppl.,* q. 42, art. 1, ad 3. This last is quoted in *Haurietis Aquas, AAS* 48 (1956), 333.

[25] *Lignum Vitae,* Fr. VIII, 30.

In his other treatise on the *Vitis Mystica,* the Seraphic Doctor proceeds from the doctrine to the devotion of the Sacred Heart, in words whose fervor of love is hardly to be paralleled elsewhere in mediaeval literature. Indeed, the whole treatise may be termed a hymn of praise and love of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, from the beginning where he speaks of the *"circumfossio vitis"* until the concluding exhortation to contemplate the Passion of Christ:

> For this also was your side pierced, that an entrance might be opened to us; for this was your Heart wounded, that we might be able to dwell in that vine, freed from all external troubles; and for this also was it wounded, that through the visible wound we might behold the invisible wound of love. Finally, let us approach that most humble Heart of Jesus most high, that is to say, through the door in His side pierced with the lance; there without doubt lies hidden an ineffable treasure of most desirable love; there will we find devotion, thence draw the grace of tears, there learn meekness and patience in adversity, and compassion for the afflicted, and there, above all, obtain a contrite and humbled heart.[26]

Here, then, more than four centuries before the revelations made to St. Margaret Mary, we discover in the Franciscan school of piety as witnessed chiefly in the writings of St. Bonaventure a full expression of the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus; and here, too, we see the outlet, as it were, of those divergent streams of Patristic meditation which we have followed from their principal source in the side of the Saviour—according to the witness of St. John.[27]

PETER C. MILWARD, S.J.

St. Mary's College
Tokyo, Japan

[26] *Vitis Mystica,* III, 5 and XXIV, 3—also quoted in *Haurietis Aquas, AAS* 48 (1956), 337.

[27] As a final note, it should be mentioned that the example of St. John, himself, both at the Last Supper and on Calvary, has contributed in no small measure to the development of devotion to the Sacred Heart. Cf. Origen: *In Joannem,* I, 6 (*PG* 14, 31); St. Gregory of Nyssa: *In Cantica Hom. I* (*PG* 44, 786); St. Augustine: *Tr. in Joannem,* I, 7 (*PL* 35, 1382); St. Paulinus of Nola: *Epist. XXI ad Amandum* (*PL* 61, 251); St. Peter Damian: *Sermo LXIII de S. Joanne* (*PL* 144, 861)—to which might be added Bossuet's sermon on the feast of St. John, 1658 (*Oeuvres Complètes,* VI, 277).

OPENING "THE CLOSED BOOK" OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Alert Catholics today are aware that within the Church the Holy Spirit is still "breathing where He will," and that the winds are blowing especially in the direction of unity. It is also evident that part of the force of that wind is coming from a renewed interest in the layman's participation in the liturgy of the Mass. And behind these sweet winds of the Spirit has come a welcome tide of enthusiasm for reading the Holy Bible.

There was a time when the family Bible was widely looked upon as an heirloom and a depository for vital information about the family tree. The Book occupied a hallowed place on the bookshelf in the parlor, and on those rare occasions when it was allowed to be opened, the reader was often one of the old folks, and the listeners usually the smaller children.

But this sort of viewpoint has lost its currency since the advent of the many new translations particularly of the New Testament. The Holy Bible, like any other title in the bookstore, is being bought and read. Thousands of adults studying literature under the auspices of the Great Books course are reading the ancient writings straight through, and they are asking each other, What does the book say? What is it about? Healthy questions these; and when the books in question are read intelligently, the questions win healthy and vigorous answers.

Still, in examining the ten longer books and the seventeen shorter works that comprise what we call The New Testament, there is one in particular which might well be called "The Closed Book." Indeed, one is tempted to imagine it as sealed tight with Seven Seals. Of course, we mean the Apocalypse of St. John, the last book of the New Law. Many, no doubt, have taken the book down from the shelf, but few have been able to open it to an intelligible page. Fools have twisted it "to their own destruction."[1] The naïve have blundered enthusiastically through its pages, distorting its meaning to fit their own fancy. The average Christian avoids it like a dark street. An interested Catholic layman read the

[1] 2 Peter 3:16.

Apocalypse for the first time just the other day. It took him less than two hours. At the end of his "ordeal," he was simply baffled. "I just don't get it," he said. The book lay closed on his desk.

But there is no longer reason for the Apocalypse to remain "a closed Book." Modern scholarship has opened up its meaning in great part. Father Bruce Vawter has made all this scholarship accessible to everyone in his pamphlet, *Revelation, A Divine Message of Hope*. A few minutes given to his little book, and one of the most consoling works of the New Testament is finally opened for us.

The Apocalypse is consoling because it is, to its core, a message of victory. Here we have "a revelation" of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ given to us *after the Ascension*. And the heart of the message is "Have confidence, I have overcome the world." Like many other parts of the New Testament, the Apocalypse is directed particularly to the people of the first century, but we must never lose sight of this truth: God's inspired word is for people of all time. We are meant to find the book as much of a revelation as did the people of St. John's own day.

Here let us consider, by way of introduction to a sensible reading of the Apocalypse, the five major doxologies in the book as they are presented to us in the light of the scholarly work of Dr. Henry Barclay Swete.[2] These are five passages in which we are allowed to hear the words which the angels and saints address to Almighty God. This celestial worship can teach *us* how to pray; but more than that, it can teach us how to understand our situation, how to hope, how to see our battle for salvation in its true focus.

In chapter four,[3] we follow St. John through the open door of heaven and share in the vision of what he sees there. Once inside the door, we are confronted with a colossal spectacle. There in the center of all, enthroned serenely amid lightning and thunder and the flashing colors of the rainbow, is the Most Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son (the Lamb), and the Holy Spirit with His seven

[2] Swete, Henry Barclay, *The Apocalypse of St. John* (New York: MacMillan, 1906). This book is the scholarly foundation of most modern interpreters of the Apocalypse.

[3] I have chosen to pass over one of the most striking doxologies in the book, that of 1:5, offered by St. John as his own, entirely apart from the visions.

gifts burning like lamps.[4] Near the throne of God are The Great Four, supreme angels full of knowledge and life.[5] Round about are The Twenty-four, the twelve Apostles and the twelve Patriarchs,[6] seated on thrones, dressed in brilliant white robes, and wearing golden crowns. Thousands of thousands of angels are also present, as well as all the creatures of the earth and sea. And in this setting, the heavenly worship of God begins. First the four supreme angels near the throne chant their eternal worship to the Holy Trinity. Their song is itself a trinity of three-phased chants, echoing Isaiah's Seraphic song[7] and serving as a model for many of the Church's official prayers.[8]

Holy, holy, holy
Is the Lord God Almighty,
Who was, and Who is, and Who is coming.[9]

Then the Twenty-four (the Apostles and Patriarchs) rise from their thrones and bow down to the ground, casting their crowns before God and saying,

Worthy art thou, O Lord our God
to receive glory and honor and power,
for thou hast created all things,
and because of thy will they have[10] existed
and were created.

Suddenly, at the right hand of God's throne, appears a Book containing God's judgments upon His enemies,[11] and an angel cries

[4] Vawter, Rev. Bruce, *Revelation—A Divine Message of Hope* (St. Louis: Knights of Columbus, 1959), p. 18.

[5] Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 67. Swete gives his agreement to the judgment of Victorinus, Andreas, and Arethas. Vawter (*op. cit.*, p. 14) calls them "the Saints of the Old and New Testaments."

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

[8] *Ibid.* Swete mentions particularly the "Te Deum." The Sanctus of the Mass is another obvious example.

[9] I have used the Confraternity translation of the New Testament for the most part. Insertions from Knox or Lilly are noted.

[10] Confraternity has merely "of Thy will they existed," but the sense of the perfect tense is evident in both Lilly and Knox and so I have presumed to use it here.

[11] Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

out asking who can open it and thus bring about its decrees[12]—and God the Son rises and stands in all the glory of His wounds, His wisdom and power clearly manifest. He takes up the great Book, and both the Four and the Twenty-four join together now, bowing down in worship of Him, and sing:

Worthy art thou to take the scroll
and to open its seals;
For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us for God with thy blood,
out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation,
And hast made of them a kingdom and priests for our God,
and they shall reign over the earth.

Then all the thousands of thousands of angels join the Four and the Twenty-four in the canticle. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, by opening the book, will preside over the future, and govern all the things that happen between the time of His Ascension and His Return.[13] All the worshipers recognize the grandeur and infinite merit of His sacrificial act, and they sing a doxology which contains a sacred number of praises, seven in all.[14]

Worthy is the Lamb who was slain to receive
power and riches[15] and wisdom and strength
and honor and glory and blessing.

And then all these worshipers are joined by every other creature in heaven and every creature on the earth and in the sea, praising equally[16] both the Father and the Son:

To Him who sits upon the throne and to the Lamb,
blessing and honor and glory and dominion
forever and ever.

And all fall down and adore God while the four supreme angels end the service,

Amen.

---

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[14] Vawter, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[15] The translations following the Vulgate have "divinity." This word from Lilly.

[16] Swete considers this very significant, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

Thus ends the first moment of celestial worship in the Apocalypse. When one first reads it, it seems impossible that anything to equal its sublimity and magnificence can be found anywhere in the Bible. But here, in this "closed book" are others of equal or even greater merit.

Another prayer arises immediately after St. John describes his vision of the destruction of God's enemies.[17] Here the great multitude which no man can number—the whole Church triumphant: all those who will be saved and who have been marked with the seal of God[18]—all stand before the holy throne of God clothed in white robes, with palms in their hands and acknowledge their Savior:

> Saving power[19] belongs to our God who sits upon the throne
> And to the Lamb.

This doxology of the Church is answered by those closer to the throne, the thousands of thousands of angels, the Great Four, and the Twenty-four. It is another sevenfold tribute, but different from all the others in the book.[20]

> Amen.
> Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving
> And honor and power and strength
> To our God forever and ever.

A third moment of triumphant prayer occurs at one of the climaxes of the Apocalypse. There have been six trumpet calls, each issuing in a vision for St. John. As soon as the long-awaited seventh trumpet blows, there are loud voices in heaven crying out their acknowledgment of the true owner of the world. It recalls the second psalm of David.[21]

> The kingdom of this world
> Has become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ
> And He shall reign forever and ever.

---

[17] Vawter, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
[18] Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
[19] "Saving power" from Knox.
[20] Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 142.

To this loud cry, the Apostles and Patriarchs answer from their thrones in praise of God's final victory which they seem to see as already complete. The pagan world (the nations)[22] battled against these Apostles and Patriarchs and against God's whole Church—but their attacks have all been futile. Now the God who "was coming" *has come*[23] on the clouds of heaven, and has judged the living and the dead:

> We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, Who art and Who wast,
> Because thou hast taken thy great power and hast begun thy reign.
> The nations have vented their rage upon us,[24]
> But thy wrath came and the time for the dead to be judged
> And for the giving the reward to thy servants—
> the prophets and the saints
> and those who fear thy name, great and small,
> And for destroying those who corrupted the earth.

Then, in chapter fifteen,[25] we come to the prayer called "The Martyrs' Song." The martyrs in John's vision use words taken almost completely from the Old Testament,[26] for God's New Law fulfills the Old. St. John says they are singing "The Song of Moses and of the Lamb," and the song definitely echoes the canticle which Moses sang after crossing the Red Sea,[27] but, in this case, it is not the wall of water, but the Lamb who has brought about their salvation. The song falls perfectly into the parallel pattern of Jewish poetry:[28]

> Great and marvellous are thy works, O Lord God Almighty;
> Just and true are thy ways, O King of the ages.
> Who will not fear thee, O Lord, and magnify thy name?
> For thou alone art holy.
> For all nations will come and worship before thee
> Because the justice of Thy decrees[29] has been manifest.

---

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] This seems the best reason for the missing phrase.

[24] "Vented their rage upon us" from Knox.

[25] I reluctantly pass over the psalm at 12:10. It is perhaps the most Christological of them all.

[26] Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] "The Justice of (thy) decrees" from Lilly.

Passing over the brief antiphonal psalm in chapter sixteen, we find in chapter nineteen the final words of worship in the Apocalypse. There are two Alleluia psalms,[30] chanted again around the throne of Almighty God and alternating between the thousands of angels, the Great Four, the enthroned Apostles and Patriarchs, and finally answered by the universal Church all together. God is exalted first for His victorious destruction of the worldly powers that have opposed Him and have killed His servants—particularly the Roman Empire,[31] elsewhere called "The Beast of the Sea," and "Babylon"; here called, as in chapter seventeen, "the great harlot." But the grounds for God's exaltation secondly—and climactically—are his establishment of His Kingdom, the Church, here signified as "the Pure Bride" of the Son of God. The psalm is begun by the angels, "a great crowd":

Alleluia!
Salvation and glory and power belong to our God
For true and just are his judgments
Who has judged the great harlot who corrupted the earth
with her immorality,[32]
And has avenged his servants' blood which her hands have shed.
Alleluia! the smoke of her burning[33] goes up everlastingly.

The Great Four and the Twenty-four, bowing down to God, answer,

Amen! Alleluia!

At that moment, the voice of one of the angels[34] intrudes, saying:

Praise our God, all you his servants
And you who fear him, the small and the great!

And finally, the entire crowd, the Universal Church sings:

---

[30] Alleluia, says Swete, is a transliteration into Greek of a liturgical note common in the psalms, at the beginning or end, or at both places, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] "Immorality" from Lilly.

[33] "Smoke of her burning . . ." from Knox.

[34] Swete thinks it an angel of the Presence, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

Alleluia!
For the Lord, our God Almighty, now reigns!
Let us be glad and rejoice and give glory to Him,
For the marriage of the Lamb has come
And his spouse has prepared herself.
And she has been permitted to clothe herself in fine linen, shining, bright,
For the fine linen is the just deeds of the saints.

And thus ends the last great liturgical scene in the Apocalypse.

We do well to bear in mind that this introduction approaches the Apocalypse from one point of view only. We have opened the "closed book," but we have looked at only one page. Nothing has been seen of the famous Four Horsemen, of the stars falling to earth, of the seven angels with trumpets and the visions of woe that follow, of the martyrdom and resurrection of the Two Witnesses, of Michael battling with Satan in the heavens, of the pressing of the Grapes of Wrath and the Lake of Blood two hundred miles long to the depth of a horse's bridle. These "revelations" too have become intelligible and meaningful through the labors of Biblical scholars: It is part of our contribution both to ecumenism and to liturgical reform to assimilate this scholarship and present it to the faithful, urged on by a zeal for the Word of God that leaves no page of the Scriptures unturned, and no single book closed.

WILLIAM H. QUIERY, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Mary's, Kansas

Answers to Questions

SUBSTITUTES FOR A HIGH MASS

Question: If occasionally (about once every two or three weeks) the organist does not appear for a scheduled High Mass, may the celebrant satisfy the obligation for the stipend if he merely sings the parts assigned to him, without having anyone to sing the responses or the parts assigned to the choir; or if he merely sings the parts assigned to him with the responses (*Et cum spiritu tuo,* etc.)? Would the answer perhaps depend on the fact that if the Mass is not offered that morning, there may be a delay of several months before it can be offered?

Answer: I believe that a Mass can be regarded as substantially a High Mass, and the stipend for a High Mass accepted, even when *some* of the requirements for a High Mass are not fulfilled —for example, if the Ordinary (*Kyrie, Gloria,* etc.) is chanted by the organist or choir, but the Proper (*Introit, Graduale,* etc.) is omitted. This is not by any means the proper way to fulfil the obligation of a High Mass, but I would regard the omissions in this case as accidental (Cfr. *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXIII, 5 [May, 1960], 349).

However, I cannot see how the truncated method suggested by the questioner can be considered as substantially fulfilling the requirements of a High Mass. Even though the Mass must be postponed for a considerable length of time, or sent elsewhere, or the stipend returned, I believe that one of these three must be done. Some have said that in such circumstances the Mass may be said for the stipend, and the solemnization—the sung portions—supplied in another Mass, for which a Low Mass stipend is accepted; but this solution does not seem to fit the present case. Of course, another solution would be to get an organist who will be more reliable.

THE VOTER'S OBLIGATION

Question: In the April issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (p. 271), it is stated that "if a Catholic cast his ballot for

a candidate because he was a Catholic and passed over a non-Catholic who, in his estimation, would make a better President, he would be guilty of sin." Will you please explain this more fully? What would be the nature of the sin in question? I have heard some say that, while a voter would commit a sin if he cast his ballot for an *unworthy* candidate, he would not sin if he chose the *less worthy* of two who would apparently both be good incumbents of the office. The argument offered is that when a person is offered two possible courses of action, one good, the other better, he commits no sin if he chooses the former, even though he could easily choose the latter.

Answer: The sin in question would be a sin against distributive justice, known technically as the "acceptance of persons." Distributive justice is a most important virtue; yet it is often overlooked. It is that subjective part (or species) of the cardinal virtue of justice which regards the obligations of a society toward its members. It prescribes that posts of honor and dignity shall be conferred on those who are most worthy to receive them, and that burdens (such as taxes) shall be imposed on those most capable of bearing them. In the words of Merkelbach, distributive justice is that which "distributes the goods and burdens of the community among the members proportionately to the suitableness they have for them" (*Summa theologiae moralis,* II, n. 611). And, as the same author explains later, in an election to public office the more worthy must be chosen among those who are eligible (*ibid.,* 619).

Usually in our textbooks, distributive justice is explained with reference to the duties of the *"princeps"* or the *"praeses."* This is a reminder of the days when the monarch chose all other public officials. The principles there laid down apply today to those in office who are empowered to choose officials in the lower brackets —for example, the school commissioner who has the right to appoint teachers, the fire commissioner who is authorized to choose the city firemen, etc. These officials have the obligation to choose the most deserving and most capable among the applicants, as far as they can honestly judge, in preference to those who may be capable of performing the required tasks, but are evidently less competent than others.

When the American voter casts his ballot he is using his right to participate in the distribution of offices or dignities that belong

to the nation or the state; and he is supposed to be imbued with the desire to confer them on those most likely to bring the most benefits to the public. He is the *"princeps"* or *"praeses"* in the conferring of important offices in our land, and has the same obligation to choose those most suited for the office (as far as he can honestly judge) as a higher official authorized to make minor appointments. If he deliberately votes for a person whom he judges to be certainly less worthy—all things considered—than another candidate, he sins against distributive justice. We cannot say that such an act is always a mortal sin. I believe it would be such when the diversity of ability between the candidates would be very great, or when some national crisis demands the very best leader. But in ordinary circumstances it would be at least a venial sin of *"acceptio personarum."*

The argument to the contrary mentioned by our correspondent —namely, that when a person is confronted with two possible choices of conduct, one good, the other better, he commits no sin if he chooses the former—does not apply to distributive justice. For, when a person decides to perform the less virtuous of two personal deeds, both of which are good (as when a Catholic decides to read the newspaper instead of making a visit to the Blessed Sacrament), he is concerned with his own spiritual welfare only, not with anything pertinent to others, and hence he may choose the less perfect act. (Some do not agree entirely with this.) Similarly, if a businessman wishes to employ his own son in his shop, in preference to some other young man who is evidently more competent, he may do so with a clear conscience because he himself is the only one who will suffer financially by the loss of a more capable employee.

Of course, many factors would have to be considered in determining who is the more worthy or the most worthy candidate. The mere fact that one man is more virtuous than the others would not necessarily indicate that he would make a better public official. In the words of Pruemmer: "There are many holy men who, though perfect in every virtue, nevertheless do not possess in such perfection the prudence required to rule" (*Manuale theologiae moralis,* I, n. 632). On the other hand, if a candidate is an immoral and irreligious man, I believe that a voter could conscientiously vote against him, even though he is the more capable man politi-

cally; for such a man, despite his superior administrative ability, might do great harm to the country.

The political parties to which the candidates belong could be given consideration toward the forming of the voter's decision. The voter who honestly believes that the principles of one party will furnish better guidance for those in office can consistently vote for candidates of that party, even though personally they may not be as competent as those of the rival party. Even the over-all anticipated results of the election of one—for example, greater peace, more economic stability in the nation because of the minor officials who are likely to be appointed—could be a determining factor in voting for a candidate, even though as an official and administrator he might not offer as good hope as his opponent.

In the ecclesiastical field, it is interesting to note this phase of distributive justice commanded by the Church: "The local Ordinary is bound, with a grave obligation of conscience, to confer a vacant parish on the one whom he shall regard as *more capable* of ruling it, without any acceptance of persons." (Can. 459 § 1.)

In the response contained in the April issue, mentioned above, I was concerned with the highest post of dignity and responsibility in the United States, the Presidency, and in particular with the religious issue, which I said should not of itself be a determining factor in the selection of a candidate. Our constitution prescribes that no religious test shall be required for public office. In our land, all religions are civilly equal; hence, all sincerely religious men, whatever their particular creed, should be regarded as equal from this standpoint. That is why I stated that "if a Catholic cast his ballot for a candidate because he was a Catholic and passed over a non-Catholic candidate who, in his estimation, would make a better President, he would be guilty of sin." In my response I was concerned only with what priests should tell their people who ask about these matters. Of course, a parallel conclusion (brought out by a priest in *Time,* with whose logic I fully agree) would be that a non-Catholic who would vote for a non-Catholic candidate for religious reasons, and would reject a Catholic candidate who he sincerely judged would make a better President, merely because he was a Catholic, would likewise be guilty of sin.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

MARKING THE PASCHAL CANDLE

Question: In the Easter Vigil service, during the ceremony of the blessing of the paschal candle, I have used the numerals with which the candle is equipped as guides for the cutting, but I have effaced them in the process. Elsewhere I see them saved. What do the "cutting" rubrics contemplate?

Answer: Your problem would be solved, it seems to me, if you drew the stilus not *over* the markings already provided on the candle but *alongside*. You would be accurately following the rubrics and at the same time preserving the colorful letters and figures provided. Fathers Bugnini and Braga, in their detailed commentary on the OHS (*Ephemerides Liturgicae,* Vol. LXX, Fasc. II-III, p. 208), remind us that the prepared markings are permitted by the *Instructio* of the OHS.

CHANT PROBLEMS

Question 1: Is the *Ite, Missa est* on Sundays during the year to be sung as a semi-double or as a double?

Answer 1: Until the missal and breviary are brought in line with the DGRS of March 23, 1955, or undergo further changes, as we are given to expect, it would seem that you could continue to use *Ite V (In Dominicis infra annum)* or, since Sundays are now doubles, you could use *Ite III* (the Roman numerals are those given in *Canon Missae*). I draw this conclusion from the option we are allowed in the use of the antiphons: we *may,* not must, double them on Sundays. In other words, we may treat the Sunday rite just as we did when it was a semi-double or we may adopt the double rite for it.

Question 2: Is there a *tonus solemnior* for the Pater Noster?

Answer 2: As far as I know, there is no *tonus solemnior* for the Pater Noster. There is none to be found with the more solemn Prefaces in the *Appendix continens Cantus ad libitum* approved in 1921 and inserted in the back of the Roman Missal.

Question 3: Which tone is to be used for the *Benedicamus Domino* on Holy Thursday?

Answer 3: Since the OHS does not specify the tone of the *Benedicamus Domino* which it prescribes in place of the previous *Ite* for Holy Thursday, it would seem that we should use *Benedicamus VII,* as given in the *Canon Missae (In Dominicis Tempore Adventus, Quadragesimae et Passionis).*

Question 4: Is the congregation to sing the *Asperges (Vidi aquam),* funerals, and weddings, or should a choir do so? Mourners, brides and bridegrooms may not feel much like singing.

Answer 4: With regard to the *Asperges (Vidi aquam),* if you have trained your congregations to sing the Sunday Mass, I see no reason why you could not bring them in time to add these chants. The situation with regard to funerals and weddings, however, is quite different. Whereas there will regularly be a large and fairly stable group at the sung Mass on Sunday, the congregations attending funerals and weddings will generally be much smaller and will vary greatly in composition, even including a number of non-Catholics. Except in small towns where there is a single closely-knit parish, we can expect little success in congregational singing of the Latin at funeral and nuptial Masses. Perhaps the day will come when the Instruction of Sept. 3, 1958 will be so generally put into practice that *peregrini* will be able to join in the singing of the Latin in whatever church they find themselves. We can dream. Meanwhile, there *is* a funeral Mass which could be very impressively sung by a large part of the congregation: I am thinking of the funeral of a priest. What need should there be of a priests' choir for such funerals? Here we have an edifyingly large gathering of the fellow priests of the deceased. In seminary days they could join in the singing of the Requiem; why not now? Why not put away the breviaries, give the laity a beautiful example of participation, and volubly raise the chanted prayer of the Requiem to heaven for the soul of the deceased. Remember, *bis orat qui bene cantat* (*bene* may be here interpreted "with the voice God gave him").

FLECTAMUS GENUA

Question: Historically, did not the celebrant intone *"Oremus"* and the deacon direct his *"Flectamus genua"* to the congregation to have them kneel while the celebrant sang the oration; and when the

celebrant had concluded, the deacon directed the *"Levate"* to the congregation?

Answer: It is true that the ceremony you describe was in use for a time ages ago but the still earlier usage, which has been restored by the OHS on Good Friday and in the Paschal Vigil, makes better sense. In the earlier ceremony the celebrant issued an invitation to prayer, whereupon the deacon gave the signal for the congregation to kneel for silent prayer. Then the deacon bade the people to rise and the celebrant, as spokesman for the congregation collected, so to speak, the prayers of all and gave voice to them in the oration which he sang.

PRIEST'S COMMUNION OUTSIDE MASS

Question: A few years ago I think I read in an old edition of Noldin that priests in lonely places where they cannot have an attendance at daily Mass can give themselves Holy Communion even daily just for devotion, without offering Holy Mass (since they would not even have a server). Is this correct today? If so, what ceremonies are used?

Answer: "A priest may administer Holy Communion to himself outside of Mass, provided that he is unable to say Mass, that there is no priest available from whom he can receive, and that he takes the necessary precautions to avoid causing scandal or wonderment. He may do so *ex sola devotione* and not merely in a case of grave necessity. This opinion is considered sufficiently probable by St. Alphonsus (*Theol. Mor.,* Lib. VI, N. 238); see also Wouters: *Theol. Mor.,* II, n. 164; Gasparri: *De Sancta Euchar.,* II, no. 1081; Noldin: *De Sacr.,* n. 125; Capello: *De Sacr.,* L, n. 337" (*Matters Liturgical,* No. 364, d). As tfor the ceremonies, I find no reference whatsoever to them in the books available to me.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

Book Reviews

THE LITURGY OF THE MASS. By Pius Parsch. Translated by Rev. H. E. Winstone, M.A. London: B. Herder, 1957. Pp. xiv + 344. $4.95.

Shortly before his death Pius Parsch completed the third revised edition of his long-popular book, *The Liturgy of the Mass.* His writing is the result of almost forty years of study and pastoral application of liturgy in Klosterneuburg, Germany. His purpose is practical: "that priests and educated laymen should have a deeper and livelier understanding of the Mass."

The first few chapters are a general introduction to the Mass. Parsch begins with the Mass as given in Scripture, tracing its pre-figurement in the Old Testament and its practice in the New. He gives an excellent exposition of the Eucharist which he calls "the heart of the mystery of the Mass." Then with a sketch of the history of the Mass and an outline of the Mass today, he presents the Mass part by part.

The chapters on each section of the Mass make the Holy Sacrifice more understandable. By pointing out historical development of the liturgy, and sometimes its decline, Parsch enables his reader to pick out the essential from the secondary. But this is always with a deeper knowledge of the mystery.

Had Father Parsch done no more his book would remain valuable for years to come. But its special features make it a treasure. The author offers many suggestions to make the Mass more meaningful to John Smith sitting in the pew. But he has the balance to add that the Holy See must always decide when and how changes will come. He offers suggestions that a priest can preach to his people to make today's Mass better appreciated. He points out, for example, that the Consecration is not a time for personal adoration of the Eucharist; this is a time for offering the sacrifice of the Christian people.

Some of his chapters are outstanding. The Offertory comes to life under his pen. He shows that in earlier days the accent was on self-surrender. The People of God brought forward their gifts as representatives of themselves. Today our Offertory stresses the fact that these gifts will become the Eucharist. Hence the host is called "this spotless victim." With this in mind it becomes clear how to correlate some of our Offertory prayers with the basic idea of our gift-giving.

His treatment of the Preface and the Canon is illuminating. The Preface of today remains much as it was in the ancient Mass. In fact, it closely resembles the entire ancient canon, or *Eucharistia,* of which it was a part. The ancient Canon, like our Preface, was predominantly a prayer of thanksgiving. The whole canon was considered the Eucharistic prayer of consecration, and at the end of it there was the elevation of the Species (our Minor Elevation). The people joined their Amen to express their participation in and approval of the sacred action. It was later that the prayers of petition came to dominate the Canon.

This is a book well worth reading and having. Without the heavy footnotes of the tome, still its historical scholarship makes it a good reference work. And the Index will provide a guide.

Pius Parsch has written for the "priest and the educated layman." The priest and future priest will find it adds depth and breadth to their appreciation of the Holy Sacrifice. The layman had better have some background. My own conviction is that he needs a preliminary grounding in the essentials of the Mass. Something like Howell's *Of Sacraments and Sacrifice* would be excellent preparation. Otherwise, before the layman reaches the essentials he may have become lost or put down this book. And this is no book to lay aside lightly.

JOHN P. BRENNAN, C.S.P.

GENERAL ETHICS. By Kenneth F. Dougherty. New York: Graymoor Press, Peekskill, N.Y., 1959. Pp. 183, with index. $3.00.

This book of general ethics covers the usual matter, simply and clearly. It is, as the subtitle states: an introduction to the basic principles of the moral life according to St. Thomas Aquinas.

From the structure of the book it is evident that this book is meant to be a textbook on the college level. It is divided into three parts. Part one deals with human destiny—of good and evil; the ultimate good; and that happiness is the ultimate end of man. Part two deals with the human act—its voluntariness; involuntary modifiers; the morality of human acts; and the virtues. Part three deals with law—the obligation to live morally—conscience; obligation and sanction; merit and demerit; crime and punishment; rights and duties.

The format is good—each chapter is headed by an outline, and ends with suggested readings and review questions. Four cases are introduced to illustrate involuntariness, five to illustrate conscience; the rest of the book is devoted to describe briefly and clearly the matter of a

first semester course in moral philosophy. The norms of morality have not been treated at length.

Modern ethical problems are introduced and rational solutions are presented according to Thomistic teaching. The author discusses nuclear warfare, the "right to work law" and unionism, slavery in the world today and human rights, the Marxist critique of ethics, freedom of religion, planned parenthood and marriage, capital punishment and other contemporary moral problems.

This book represents the third in the author's Collegiate Philosophical Series, the other two books being *Logic*, $2.50, and *Cosmology*, $3.00 per copy.

METHODIUS F. CIKRIT

ANSCAR VONIER, ABBOT OF BUCKFAST. By Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1957. Pp. x + 154. 7 illustrations. $3.25.

Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B., a monk of Buckfast, is well-qualified to sketch the life of the second founder of Buckfast Abbey. Dom Graf shared many experiences with Anscar Vonier in religious life, and they had been boyhood friends, too. But this book is not a biography of Anscar Vonier. It is rather a biography of the restoration of Buckfast Abbey, and an appreciation of its first abbot.

After the first chapter, which tells of Abbot Vonier's childhood, the author makes a long digression. He pauses to relate how it came about that over 300 years after King Henry VIII of England despoiled Buckfast Abbey, a handful of Benedictine monks reclaimed it for the Catholic Church. These monks had been violently expelled from the Abbey of La Pierre-qui-vire in France. While living temporarily in Ireland one of their number read a letter in the London *Tablet* which suggested that "in view of the fact that just then a number of expelled communities were seeking asylum in England, it would be a grand thing if one of them were to acquire an old monastic foundation in the West of England—Buckfast Abbey." The owner was a Protestant but wished "that the place should again come into the hands of the Catholic Church" and he would "agree to very liberal terms in treating with any Order who would become a purchaser." Thus easily was Henry VIII's work undone.

The first monks arrived on October 28, 1882. Restoration of the buildings on the original foundations began in 1883. From 1889 the story of Buckfast is interwoven with that of Anscar Vonier, especially after 1906 when he became abbot and made the momentous decision to

restore the great abbey church, and then saw his project through to completion. He died the same month that the last scaffolding on the central tower of the church was removed—December 1938.

A chapter evaluating Vonier's writings and one on his preaching neatly fill out the picture of Vonier's very active life. His numerous preaching invitations show the prestige he enjoyed among his contemporaries; the effect of his writing continues to this day. Just as the restoration of Buckfast was not for the monks alone but became a symbol of the rebirth of Catholicism in England, so Vonier's purpose in writing was also apostolic, "We must write spiritual books instinct with doctrine—we must give the people solid theology, for they hunger for such spiritual food."

The last chapters are an appreciation of Vonier's role as monk and abbot. Dom Graf was close enough to him to know his strength and his weakness. Both make us wish that we knew him better.

A definitive life of Anscar Vonier will probably never be written because of the paucity of documents, papers, diaries, letters, etc., of the abbot. But Dom Graf has done a great service by introducing us to this great personality through his life work—the restoration of Buckfast Abbey—and by showing his place in Catholic literature and English Catholic history.

ROBERT A. MIZE, C.S.P.

THE HOURS OF THE DAY: LATIN-ENGLISH DIURNAL. By The Assumptionist Fathers. New York: Desclee. Pp. 1496. Cloth, $8.25; Leather, $10.50.

These days when agitation for the vernacular in the liturgy has been so pronounced, those reciting the Divine Office will find *The Hours of the Day* a most welcome volume and very, very helpful. For who of us is not faced from time to time with the difficulties of translating or understanding to the fullest the psalms or prayers of the breviary?

Some may object that this very compact volume of the breviary does not include Matins. But it does have other distinct advantages. In the introduction we read that "in the strict sense of the word, it is not therefore a liturgical book subject to the March 23, 1955, Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, delaying the application (in the liturgical books) of *the simplified rules of the Roman Breviary which are introduced in this Diurnal.*" And so the various parts, (Paters, Aves, etc.) not dropped or omitted in the one volume or four volume complete breviaries, do not appear in this handy volume. The directives that all obligated to the Roman breviary have found confusing concerning cer-

tain offices (e.g., Doubles of the Second Class) are incorporated in this Latin-English Diurnal. So this handy volume avoids much of the confusion that many have found since the new directives took effect, January 1, 1956.

There is an excellent introduction which is at the same time an explanation of the mechanics of the various offices as well as a ferverino for the one reciting the required psalms and prayers. The volume is well printed on good paper, conveniently arranged in parallel columns, with an excellent translation of the psalms of the New Psalter.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

AWAKENERS OF SOULS. By F. X. Ronsin, S.J. New York: Society of St. Paul, 1957. Pp. 304. $3.00.

How does one awaken souls? Who are those who awaken souls? The "how" of the awakening process is accomplished by knowing them, understanding them, forming them, and loving them. The agents of the awakening are parents, educators, civic and military leaders. This, simply expressed, is the theme of this book. The body is king and has been king for many years and now it is time that souls were recognized for their true worth. The author's simple plea is that too many individuals have lived and died without assenting to the fact that they have a soul which should be cared for as well, if not better than the body.

All men have a great responsibility toward their fellowmen, whether they are employers, teachers, civic or military leaders, or parents whose unquestioned responsibility has not always been met. In order to do this, souls must be known. To know souls demands a knowledge of the rights which souls possess—the right to conscience, the right to an ideal and the right to greatness. Understanding souls involves the comprehension of the desires and ideals of different ages from childhood to old age. It means understanding different temperaments and characters. It embraces understanding the different situations of success and failure.

Forming souls encompasses the humanizing of young people and developing an harmonious balance of the faculties of the soul. The consciousness of God and fraternal charity, which includes the Christian concept of suffering, are essential in this formation. The loving of souls includes those self-sacrifices, which are all too rare, of true heroes. It rests content with the recompenses of charity and the fulfillment of love for neighbor.

All these aspects of human living have been developed with succinct insight and lively prose by the author of this work. It is truly an

unusual book. Every phase of life is treated. The duties of husbands and wives towards one another, the essentials of the Christian home, the duties of all in charge of normal or abnormal children, the general's relationship to his men, the factory owner toward his workers, and the mutual obligations of friendship are treated with sympathetic understanding and richness of material. Most tender and beautiful is the treatment on the duties and rights of the aged and the possibility of sanctifying life in every generation.

The author makes no endeavor to present the ultimate answers to the problems of the world, but rather draws upon the wealth of his experience to offer the simple application of Christian principles to every experience in life. Father Ronsin was born in Brittany, France, in 1889. Twenty-five years of his life have been devoted to forming his younger brothers in religion, and for fifteen of those years he has been in charge of large houses of formation. At the time of publication of this book he was superior of *École Apostolique* in Poitiers. It is obvious that he knows whereof he speaks. Previous works by this author, *Pour Mieux Gouverner* and *Gouverner C'est Aimer,* are well known to religious superiors to whom they were addressed. Now, in a work that may be correctly termed unique, Father Ronsin has directed his thoughts to the laity. For the laity truly may be the "awakeners of souls" of those with whom they come in contact.

It is a sad commentary to realize that builders of souls receive little recognition. Their works are unknown, their sacrifices unnoticed save by God. It is He Who is the only one capable of discerning the exact share of each of those who united their efforts to build the souls they cared for and only He can reward those moral victories which pass unsung by nations, but which build the very fiber of countries.

This is not a book which should be limited to a select group of readers. It will be of equal value to priests, nuns, nurses, laborers, lawyers and social workers as well as to the parents and educators for whom it must have a special meaning. This book deals with the "stuff of life" and cannot but change for the better all who peruse its pages.

JOHN F. NEVINS

FATHER OF THE FAMILY. By Eugene S. Geissler. Chicago, Illinois: Fides Publishing Association, 1959. Pp. 157. $1.25.

It was not so long ago that Donald J. Thorman, writing in *Act,* the news organ of the Christian Family Movement, pointed up the lack of material available dealing with the practical realities of the lay Christian life. Ives Congar, O.P. and Gerald Philips have ably pre-

sented the speculative side of the question, but who, asks Mr. Thorman, will translate these concepts into the popular language of economic, political and family life? Eugene Geissler has given his reply to the problems and questions that confront the layman in married life.

The author, being the proud father of nine children, may rightly claim some authority in this field. He has divided his book into two sections: "Impressions" and "Reflections." His first section is a series of personal family experiences; it is one father sharing some of his joys and sorrows with the rest of the world. His "Impressions" have a lightness and a keen laugh-at-yourself-type of humor. They are about Sarah and Mary and Peter and Nora and all the others. At times the friendly, informal presentation tends to obscure the underlying practical wisdom. This defect may easily discourage the reader from moving past the first section. Such would be regrettable, for the author's "Reflections" are both stimulating and informative.

The author has a vital grasp of his place as a father in the Mystical Body of Christ. He is conscious of his duties to his wife, to his children, to his Church, to his community. He speaks out frankly and clearly of the father's place to provide "far beyond food, clothing and shelter." The Christian father must form and direct his children in both their individual and social lives. He must make his own contribution to the society in which he lives; more, he must assist his wife and children in making theirs. The author understands the father's responsibility and he ably conveys this to the reader.

The book has its failings. There is little, if any, determined order to it. In places, the author is so close to people and events that his writing suffers from an overly-familiar style. But he can never be accused of boring the reader. Nor will a Christian father come away from this book unsatisfied. *Father of the Family* offers some pleasant reading and perhaps a smile; much more, it helps the reader to form an awareness of what it means to be a father.

JOSEPH DREW, C.S.P.

Books Received

THE SEARCH FOR VALUES. By Russell Coleburt. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960. Pp. 135. $3.00.

THE PASTORAL SERMONS OF RONALD A. KNOX. Edited by Philip Caraman, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960. Pp. xvi + 532. $8.50.

ALCOHOLISM: A SOURCE BOOK FOR THE PRIEST. AN ANTHOLOGY. Indianapolis: National Clergy Conference on Alcoholism, 1960. Pp. x + 685. $6.95.

APOSTLE AND APOSTOLATE. By Lucien Cerfaux. Translated by Donald D. Duggan. New York: Desclee, 1960. Pp. 184. $2.75.

CITADEL OF WISDOM. By Robert J. O'Connell, S.J. Bay Shore, N. Y.: Montfort Publications, 1960. Pp. ix + 114. $3.00.

SOURCES OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. Volume II: SACRAMENTS AND FORGIVENESS. Edited by Paul F. Palmer, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. xxv + 410. $6.00.

THE RASCAL AND THE PILGRIM: THE STORY OF THE BOY FROM KOREA. By Joseph Anthony. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1960. Pp. xiv + 242. $3.75.

THE PARISH PRIEST'S GUIDE TO INQUIRY CLASSES. Edited by John D. Mitchell, C.S.P. New York: Paulist Press, 1960. Pp. 256. $5.95.

ÜBERLIEFERUNG: TRADITION UND SCHRIFT IN DER EVANGELISCHEN UND KATHOLISCHEN THEOLOGIE DER GEGENWART. By Peter Lengsfeld. Paderborn: Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1960 (Johann-Adam-Möhler-Institut). Pp. 263. DM 16.—.

THE BOOK OF EXODUS. Part II. Commentary by Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm. New York: Paulist Press, 1960. Pp. 96. 75¢.

PLEDGE OF GLORY. By Dom Eugene Vandeur. Translated by the Dominican Nuns of Corpus Christi Monastery. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1958. Pp. x + 238. $3.00.

THE QUEST FOR THE HOLY GRAIL. A Literary Study of a Thirteenth-Century French Romance. By Frederick W. Locke. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1960. Pp. iii + 126. $3.50.

HARVEST 1960: A SELECTION OF THE BEST ARTICLES FROM THE CATHOLIC PRESS PUBLISHED DURING THE PAST YEAR. Edited by Dan Herr and Paul Cuneo. Westminster, Md. Newman, 1960. Pp. xiv + 289. $3.50.

AN APOSTLE OF FREEDOM: LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF NICOLAS BERDYAEV. By Michel Alexander Vallon. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. Pp. 370. $6.00.

THE LURE FOR FEELING. By Mary A. Wyman. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. Pp. xiii + 192. $4.75.

THE PRINCIPLE OF TRUTH. By Peter D. King. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. Pp. iii + 110. $3.75.

GETTING TO KNOW THE BIBLE. By Joseph F. X. Cevetello. New York: Society of St. Paul, 1957. Pp. 231. $2.50.

JESUS THE SAVIOUR. By Father James, O.F.M.Cap. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1956. Pp. vi + 145. $2.50.

THE EDUCATION OF THE NOVICE. By Ambrose Farrell, O.P., Henry St. John, O.P., and F. B. Elkisch. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1956. Pp. ix + 73. No price given.

MARQUETTE LEGENDS. By Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M. New York: Pageant Press, 1960. Pp. xxi + 350. $5.00.

PETER CLAVER, SAINT OF THE SLAVES. By Angel Valtierra, S.J. Translated by Janet H. Perry and L. J. Woodward. Westminster, Md., Newman, 1960. Pp. 328. $4.75.

CATECHISM OF CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING. By Amintore Fanfani. Translated by Henry J. Yannone. Westminster, Md., Newman, 1960. Pp. xxvii + 208. $2.95.

ENCOUNTERS WITH SILENCE. By Karl Rahner, S.J. Translated by James M. Demske, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. 87. $1.95.

PATROLOGY. By Berthold Altaner. Translated by Hilda C. Graef. New York: Herder and Herder, 1960. Pp. xxiv + 660. $10.00.

THE JURIDICAL ASPECT OF INCORPORATION INTO THE CHURCH OF CHRIST—CANON 87. By Albert A. Reed, C.PP.S. Carthagena, Ohio: Messenger Press, 1960. Pp. xix + 123. $2.50.

THE SCIENCE OF THE CROSS: A STUDY OF ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS. By Edith Stein. Translated by Hilda Graef. Chicago: Regnery, 1960. Pp. xxii + 243. $4.75.